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ABSTRACT

The focus of this Executive Leadership Paper (EPP) is to address the academic performance of the high needs schools within the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). High needs schools have been a long standing focus of districts. Districts and schools are continuously looking for the “silver bullet” to attack low student performance. This EPP identifies the best practices in reading, mathematics, interventions and professional development. It also presents a model of support for high needs schools based on the research reviewed and the best practices identified.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The goal of my EPP was to design and implement a support model for high needs schools within the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). I am defining a high need school as a school who has the designation Corrective Action I or Corrective Action II. The two aforementioned designations are assigned to a school or district by the state of Pennsylvania when the school or district has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for at least four consecutive years. In 2008, the SDP created the Empowerment Model to provide structured support and resources in the areas of instruction, leadership, student and family support and operations to high needs schools. This was accomplished by directly training the school leadership and teaching staff within the schools as well as modeling best practices that they were expected to incorporate into their daily routines. The expectation was that the combination of training and modeling would ultimately prepare school leadership and staff for autonomy, independence and academic success.
K-8 Instructional Support Model

For the purpose of my EPP, I focused only on the instructional component of the support model in K-8 schools. My objective was to identify the effective components and instructional practices within K-8 schools that have a positive impact on improving high needs schools as well as the supports needed by high needs schools to implement them. The development of the instructional component of the support model eventually focused on four areas: the role of the district in improving high needs schools, programmatic changes, professional development and monitoring.

Role of the District

The district has a role in improving high needs schools, but the question was what should the role be? The study, Beyond islands of Excellence: What Districts Can Do to Improve Instruction and Achievement in All Schools (Togneri & Anderson, 2003), stated that for school systems to become excellent, “Our nation has a moral imperative to close the achievement gap between low income students and their more advantaged peers…which will demand system wide approaches that touch every child in every school in every district across the nation” (p.1). One of the more consistent debates in the arena of school improvement focuses on what is the best approach to support and improve high needs schools. My focus here was to determine whether the decision-making process should be centralized or decentralized.
Programmatic Changes

Programmatic changes focused on identifying the key elements of an effective instructional model and the best practices to implement them with fidelity. All critical elements must work together to improve the learning environment. Effective core and supplemental instructional materials, instructional practice, and professional development are three major elements critical to improving student achievement. To be successful in identifying and implementing all three, it is essential to know not only what works, but what works in a particular environment. The research was reviewed to determine best practices to improve the both student reading and mathematics and effective reading and mathematics interventions.

Professional Development

Professional development addressed how to best support the staff assigned to high needs schools. The research was reviewed to determine key components that makes up effective professional development for teachers, particularly related to improving teacher pedagogical delivery and content knowledge.
Monitoring and Support

Monitoring and supporting schools and the staff assigned to these schools are pivotal to their improvement. Without both, often improvement efforts wither and die. Monitoring allows all to know what is working and what is not working. It also identifies areas where targeted support is needed. The research was reviewed to identify best practices regarding monitoring and supporting schools.

Organization of EPP

The remainder of my EPP is organized into five additional chapters: the problem (Chapter 2), improvement strategies (Chapter 3), improvement strategies results (Chapter 4), reflections on improvement effort results (Chapter 5) and reflections on my leadership development (Chapter 6). The final chapter will be followed by the references and the appendices which include the original EPP proposal and all completed artifacts.

Chapter 2 will identify the organization, the problem and its historical context, including what was done previously to address the problem. I will discuss my role within the organization and my ability to influence and improve the problem. This chapter also will identify my EPP improvement goals.

Chapter 3 describes the actions taken to address the problem and help the organization improve, including a rationale to support the actions taken. I will also outline the overall solution and provide specific information regarding the
implementation of the strategies, the necessary resources and the timeline to complete them.

Chapter 4 describes the results of the improvement initiative and the evidence to support the outcomes. The discussion will focus on the following: what evidence reveals about the improvement effort, determining if the improvement strategies were implemented successfully and were the intended outcomes met.

The next chapter (Chapter 5) will discuss my reflections on the improvement effort. Within this chapter I will identify what worked and what needs to be redesigned if the organization is going to improve. I will also provide some next steps and recommendations for the organization to continue work in this area.

The last chapter (Chapter 6) will focus on my own personal growth and development as a result of participating in the Ed. D program. I will discuss how I have improved as a scholar, problem solver and partner.
Chapter 2

THE PROBLEM

The School District of Philadelphia (SDP) is a K-12 urban public school system with 347 schools. District schools can be categorized as neighborhood, magnet, comprehensive or career/vocational/technical schools. Within those schools, the district provides a range of instructional programs, supports and services for all learners. Table 1 below outlines the breakdown of schools.

Table 1: Types of Schools in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SDP currently employs 10,709 teachers with an average age of 44 and an average of 13 years of experience in the district. Table 2 listed below outlines the ethnic breakdown of the teachers employed by the district.
Table 2: Ethnic Representation of Teachers Employed by the SDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SDP serves approximately 195,411 students (including charter schools).

Within the student population, 76% are identified as Low Income, 7% as English Language Learners, 15% as Special Education. Table 3 describes the ethnic breakdown of the students in the district.

Table 3: Ethnic Representation of Students in the SDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of Students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools and districts are measured by the number of schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). When AYP began in 2002, 9% of the schools managed by the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) were meeting AYP. In 2003, 62% of the schools in the state made AYP, but in the district only 23% made AYP. By 2009 only 46% were meeting AYP within the district while 77% of the schools within the state were meeting AYP. Table 4 shows the percentage of schools by management type that met AYP targets from 2002-2009.
Table 4: Percent of Schools that Made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) by Management Type from 2002-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Type</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Change '02-'09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District managed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania total</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change from 2003-2009; 2002 figures not available

In the SDP, 51% of the students are not proficient in Mathematics and 55.2% of the students are not proficient in Reading. Table 5 shows the percentage of students below proficiency on the PSSA in Mathematics and Reading within the district from 2002 to 2008.

Table 5: Percent of Students Below Proficiency in Reading and Mathematics from 2002-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The district has tried to address the high needs schools through various supports and services, including targeted professional development and support, employing
additional academic coaches and content specialists from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, and purchasing interventions to be used district-wide.

Targeted professional development and support were provided to schools that were in school improvement by the Office of School Intervention and Support (OSIS). OSIS was responsible for the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Training was provided on the school improvement planning process to help schools in their development and completion of their SIP. OSIS also used the SIP to guide and support schools in their improvement efforts. OSIS managed and monitored school improvement efforts through the School Assistance Team (SAT), which assisted schools in building their capacity to use data to support improvement efforts. OSIS provided each school with a SAT Case Manager to lead the SAT process. The SAT Case Manager provided schools with best practices to address deficiencies and led walkthroughs periodically to monitor progress. OSIS also provided the schools with a Monthly Planner to focus schools in the areas of instruction and data.

The district employed a large number of content specialists in the Office of Curriculum and Instruction. The role of the content specialists was to develop supplemental curricular documents to support teachers’ implementation of the core academic programs and provide support at the school level in their respective content area. Teachers could attend professional development offered by content specialists to gain a better understanding of the content area, materials, and resources utilized.
The district created a district-approved intervention list to provide schools with research-based programs and resources. The expectation was that schools would only purchase programs and resources from this list to support their students. If schools had interest in a particular intervention, they would contact the vendor to discuss and purchase. The district also purchased Read 180 and Fast Forward to implement district-wide. The district purchased these interventions to address the needs of students in the comprehensive high schools in a concerted manner. The Office of High Schools researched various products and felt these two programs aligned best with the instructional focus in the high schools. The Office of High Schools provided initial training and monitored usage via quarterly reports.

In 2008, Dr. Arlene Ackerman became Superintendent of the SDP and her focus was on improving student learning and student achievement. This focus led to the analysis of student achievement data for the schools within the district. What was discovered was very alarming. As stated earlier, more than half of the district was not proficient in reading or mathematics, but when the data was disaggregated over the past few years, the performance of some of the schools within the district was far worse. Eighty-five of the 266 schools were underperforming significantly. These schools were categorized with the most severe AYP status of Corrective Action I (CAI) or Corrective Action II (CAII). When these 85 schools were grouped together, their performance in reading and mathematics was significantly worse. The percentage of students not proficient in these 85 high needs schools was at least 8% more in reading and at least 11% more in mathematics when compared to the remaining district schools. Table 6
shows the percentage of students who are not proficient in Reading and Mathematics in these schools for the past four school years.

Table 6: Percent of Students Not Proficient in Reading and Mathematics in Empowerment Schools from 2005-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>85 High Needs Schools</th>
<th>District Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Addressing student learning and achievement in these high needs schools was Ackerman’s first major initiative (i.e., the Imagine 2014 Strategic Plan). One of her first steps was to have an external team conduct an external audit. The team visited schools and met with central office staff to learn about district and school practices; they also were provided with data on the CAI and CAII schools. The primary focus of the audit was the above 85 schools. The audit identified five major concerns (see Table 7).

Table 7: Major Findings of Preliminary Audit of 85 High Needs Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Audit Finding</th>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of rigor in instruction and curriculum</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoherent instructional strategies</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High number of inexperienced teachers</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low student achievement</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High number of inexperienced administrators</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low student attendance</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low parental involvement</td>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination of resources</td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, the audit revealed weaknesses in the instructional program. There was a lack of rigor in the classroom. Teachers did not use effective instructional strategies to advance and support the learning of students. The audit team also found that these schools had concentrated numbers of teachers with three years or less of experience, compared to the district average of 13 years of experience. Combining weak instructional programs with novice teachers is not likely to promote student learning.

Second, the audit team found that the majority of these schools also lacked experienced leadership. Most of the principals assigned to these schools had less than five years of experience. Administrators with the least experience were being placed in the neediest environments. Being an administrator in a high needs school is a demanding position, and it is even more difficult as a young administrator.

Third, the attendance of the staff and students was low and parental involvement was lacking. Students in the high needs schools were absent from their classrooms and there was not a clear concerted plan to address absenteeism. The audit team also found that parent relationships and communication were in need of repair.

Finally, school personnel did not view the resources, supports and services being provided as an integrated effort. They did not see the connections between the multiple services and resources being provided. The resources and services were scattered and implementation was inconsistent. School personnel were not confident that what was being provided addressed their needs and often viewed these supports as an add-on to
their already full routines. The schools also were getting conflicting messages from offices and did not have a clear point of contact for guidance and support.

As a result of the audit findings, Superintendent Ackerman identified the 85 schools within the district with CAI and CAII AYP status as Empowerment Schools. The Empowerment School initiative became her vision for supporting high needs schools within the district. The expectation is that Empowerment Schools will receive support, resources and services in the areas of instruction, leadership, student and family support, and operations. The Superintendent also created the Office of Empowerment Schools Support (OESS) to develop, implement and coordinate a support model to provide internal and external resources for the high needs schools.

I was assigned to OESS as the Director of Intervention and Evaluation. OESS was a newly created office within the district to support and manage the 85 high needs schools within the district. OESS was a stand-alone office that reported directly to the superintendent of the district. As the director of the office, it was my responsibility to build the Empowerment Model. I was given the autonomy to develop the framework and key components of the model to be implemented. I worked with my supervisor, the Deputy of the Office of Empowerment Schools, to develop the components of the model, including what resources were going to be provided to schools, how the resources were going to be provided and by whom, and how it was going to be implemented and monitored. As the Director of Intervention and Evaluation, I was also responsible for the design and implementation of the professional development being provided to the SBISs,
teachers and administrators. I also managed the various partnerships established with various publishing companies to support the high needs schools. Simply put, I was the individual on the ground assuring that every phase and aspect of the model was being implemented as designed.
Chapter 3

IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

There were four phases in the development the Empowerment Model. The first phase was to study the problem. The second phase was to design the Empowerment Model, which included programmatic changes in the areas of reading, mathematics, interventions and professional development. The third phase focused on monitoring and the final phase emphasized identifying the best forum to inform parents and students about the Empowerment Model.

Phase 1: Study the Problem

The first step in studying the problem was to write the problem statement. The problem statement (Appendix A) identified the area of concern and focus with the SDP. The problem statement also outlined the goals of the inquiry and potential artifacts.
Literature Review

The second step in this phase was the literature review (Appendix B). The purpose was to identify the effective instructional practices within K-8 schools that have had a positive impact on improving high needs schools and the supports needed to implement these practices. The literature review focused on the following areas: the role of the district in improving high needs schools, programmatic changes, professional development and monitoring.

Role of the District

One of the more consistent debates in the arena of school improvement focuses on what is the best approach to support and improve high needs schools. Should the decision-making process be centralized or decentralized? There were three themes emphasized in the literature in regard to the role of the district in improving schools: taking a centralized approach with shared ownership and responsibility with the school based staff; utilizing research-based practices; and committing to the identified and agreed upon programmatic and instructional practices long term to see the best results. The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) found that central office staff had a more objective and stronger commitment to research and evidence than school-based staff when it came to identifying programs. Although both parties used research, central office staff seemed to be more comfortable than the teaching staff (Corcoran, Fuhrman and Belcher, 2001).
The research literature suggested that a centralized approach is more effective in improving high needs schools. However, it is important to make sure that school administrators and teachers are a part of the decision making process. The adoption and effectiveness of any improvement agenda is predicated on the understanding, involvement and acceptance of the individuals responsible for implementation. The results can be very positive, but teachers’ acceptance of the recommended instructional approach and/or intervention plays a major role in determining the likelihood that it will continue to be used over time (Polloway, Bursuck, Jayanthi, Epstein, and Nelson, 1996).

As noted above, central office staff is more inclined than school-based staff to use research to identify and determine the most effective practices to improve the school. While reviewing the research, I found that teachers have a tendency to make decisions about curriculum and instructional strategies based on personal preference and experience rather than research. Relying on research-proven instructional strategies has a greater likelihood of success.

The final big takeaway in this area was a long-term commitment to the work. In this new environment of high stakes accountability, schools and districts are looking for the quick fix and immediate results, which usually results in temporary, but unsustainable improvement. The research was very clear about the need to allow the time for the identified research based practices to work. Typically, it takes about three to five years to see the desired gains and growth in the targeted area.
Improving schools require that core and supplemental instructional materials, instructional practice, and professional development are aligned and complement each other. To be successful in identifying and implementing all three, it is essential to know not only what works, but also what works in the targeted environment.

Programmatic Changes

Programmatic changes focused on improving student reading and mathematics, professional development and monitoring.

As illustrated by Table 5 above, more than half of the students within the district were not proficient in reading and mathematics in 2008. This has been a longstanding trend within the school district. Examination of student performance data made it clear that if students within the high needs schools were going to improve academically, a change had to be made in both the curriculum resources and materials and instructional practices used within the schools.

To improve students’ reading performance, the research was clear about what works. The National Reading Panel (NRP) provided Congress with a report in 2000, which focused its research and findings on five areas (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension) as key elements necessary when teaching reading (National Reading Panel (US) and National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (US), 2000). The report recommended that districts or schools should choose reading curricula that explicitly and systematically teach children phonemic
awareness; provide systematic phonics instruction; include isolated teaching of sounds associated with letters and then blending together; do not encourage a large amount of independent reading; provide vocabulary instruction that is taught both directly and indirectly utilizing multiple methods; explicitly teach the six most effective comprehension strategies (i.e., comprehension monitoring, use of graphic and semantic organizers, question answering, question generation, story structure and summarization); and provide explicit instruction (i.e., direct explanation, modeling, guided practice and application).

Unlike reading, the literature in the area of mathematics is less prescriptive. Nevertheless, the research provides insights on how mathematics should be taught, what good mathematics instruction should look like and the need to improve the quality and knowledge of mathematics teachers. Three critical components were identified to provide effective mathematics instruction: teaching for conceptual understanding, developing children's procedural literacy, and promoting strategic competence through meaningful problem-solving investigations (Cobb and Jackson, 2011; Shellard and Moyer, 2002).

Scripted programs have a greater impact on student outcomes than non-scripted programs. Two studies (Supovitz, & May, 2003; MacIver, Kemper, & Stringfield, 2003) found two scripted instructional programs (i.e., America’s Choice, Direct Instruction) produced greater test score gains for students enrolled in the two programs. They attributed the gains to the provision of a clear framework for implementation, assessment and monitoring student progress. The framework outlined explicitly what the teacher is
expected to teach and how. It clearly defined what it looked like when the student is learning. Monitoring checkpoints and the expected rate of success were identified to measure student growth and achievement. The framework also informed the teacher when a student should move to the next level or exit the program altogether. Although scripted programs are more effective, it is important to work closely with the teachers using the program because many feel that their creativity and expertise are minimized.

Professional Development

Researchers have spent extensive time trying to determine the difference between high performing and underperforming schools. One of the main indicators identified by the research focuses on the professional learning opportunities within schools. Two studies (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson and Orphanos, 2009; Wei, Darling-Hammond and Adamson, 2010) identified five big ideas to delivering effective professional development and providing learning opportunities within schools. Effective professional development: 1) is intensive, ongoing, and connected to practice, 2) focuses on the teaching and learning of specific academic content, 3) is connected to other school initiatives and builds strong working relationships among teachers, 4) must be consistent and provide time for staff learning, engage staff in learning activities that are a direct reflection of their school improvement plan, and 5) identifies rigorous learning objectives and expected outcomes.

The findings presented by the above two studies underscore the need for a professional development environment that provides the opportunity for teachers to
practice and engage in learning with and from their colleagues. Practice-oriented staff development carried out at the school building level was identified as a characteristic of unusually effective schools (i.e., schools that have much higher achievement than most other schools enrolling similar groups of students) in a comprehensive review of effective schools research (Levine and Lezotte, 1990). Job embedded professional development provides teachers the opportunity for site-based practice.

Wei, et al (2010) and her colleagues identified various forms of job-embedded professional development, but viewed instructional coaching as one of the most effective forms. The research was clear regarding the performance of teachers when they are coached. Teachers practice new strategies more frequently and have a greater probability of understanding, utilizing and retaining the new skills and strategies in which they had been coached (L’Allier, Elish-Piper and Bean, 2010).

An instructional coach is viewed as the “expert” when it comes to content knowledge and pedagogy. However, an instructional coach needs to be more than an expert in their content area. An instructional coach also needs to develop and cultivate the other skills that help them work effectively with teachers, including facilitation, the ability to work with adult learners, and knowledge of the change process (Cogshall, Behrstock-Sherratt and Drill, 2011). To be able to effectively develop and support a teacher, the instructional coach also needs to be developed and supported as well.
Monitoring and Support

There were no studies that spoke directly to monitoring. However, during my review of the literature it was an integral part of the programs and practices identified to be effective. Simmons (2011) identified lessons learned from eight Chicago schools, including the need for check points to measure and make midcourse corrections and a cycle of monitoring and support. Rowan, Correnti, Miller and Camburn (2009) also discussed the pivotal role of monitoring as it relates to the effectiveness of scripted intervention programs.

To be successful in their efforts to improve teaching and learning and student achievement, districts and schools must have a cycle of continuous monitoring and support. The cycle of continuous monitoring and support affords schools and administrators the ability to know what is working and what is not. Schools and districts must have the opportunity to view, collect evidence, discuss and reflect on instructional practice.

An effective monitoring model is based upon what the program should look like when it is working. It is also important to clearly define the parameters to assure the program is being measured appropriately. The tools used to collect the information also need to be aligned to the program expectations and desired outcomes. Lastly, monitoring models are most effective when the participants all share the same meaning and understanding of the concepts and terms.
Phase 2: Design the Empowerment Model

Due to the urgency expressed by the superintendent, the overall timeline to implement the model was continuous. The initial planning occurred over a three week period focusing on developing a skeletal framework for implementation. This foundational framework identified personnel, programmatic needs and a timeline of implementation for each element. The design phase of the Empowerment Model resulted in three artifacts: the curriculum and intervention logic maps, the intervention learning pathways and the Philadelphia Do Now!

Curriculum and Intervention Logic Models

The Empowerment Model was designed to provide support, resources and services in the areas of instruction, leadership, student and family support and operations. The intent and purpose of the resources and services was to provide structured support and guidance to implement best practices that have a positive impact on teaching and learning. This was accomplished by modeling and training the leadership and staff within the schools, ultimately preparing the school staff and leadership for autonomy, independence and academic success. My EPP focused on the instructional component of the model and the logic models outline the process and implementation to meet the goal.

The Logic Models (Appendix C) provided a graphic representation of the relationship among the forces that will shape the Empowerment Model. The logic models also served as a blueprint and implementation guide of the Empowerment Model. A logic model was created for two areas, intervention and curriculum. The two logic models
outlined the explicit steps that were taken to identify the core curriculum materials and the intervention materials as well as the steps that were taken to professionally develop teachers and administrators on the instructional materials. The outcomes were identified to inform us if the programs were implemented with fidelity. Graphic 1 is an illustration of the intervention logic model, which outlines the process and desired outcomes associated with identifying and implementing the interventions used in the Empowerment Schools model.

Graphic 1: Empowerment Schools Intervention Logic Model

Graphic 2 is an illustration of the curriculum logic model, which outlines the process and desired outcomes associated with identifying, and implementing the curriculum used in the Empowerment Schools models.
Graphic 2: Empowerment Schools Curriculum Logic Model

Defining the Model

Based on the best practices identified through research there were several changes made to the core and supplemental instructional materials that were going to be used within Empowerment Schools. The SDP purchased Imagine It! as the reading curricula and Prentice Hall as the mathematics curricula to be used within Empowerment Schools. Imagine It! was chosen based on the research related to improving students reading abilities. The design of the Imagine reading curricula appropriately addressed all of the key indicators outlined in the NRP study. It provided explicit and systematic instruction
in the areas of phonemic awareness and phonics. It also provided explicit instruction in the six text comprehension strategies. It also provided an abundance of resources and materials to support the teacher in their planning and delivery of instruction.

The existing mathematics program for grades K-5, Everyday Mathematics, remained in place, but a change was made to the middle grades mathematics program. Prentice Hall was chosen as the mathematics curricula based on the research related to improving students’ mathematics abilities. The Prentice Hall mathematics curricula appropriately addressed all of the key elements identified within the research. It provided a balance of skill-based instruction and problem solving as well as a focus on procedural fluency and conceptual understanding. Prentice Hall also placed a heavy emphasis on supporting teachers. There were extensive professional development resources available to teachers on-line to support their development and understanding of mathematics content. There were also an array of supports and resources to aid teachers in their planning and delivery of their daily lesson. To implement the reading and mathematics curricula, the specific components of the program to address the academic needs of the student population were identified and purchased. A professional development plan for teachers, instructional coaches and administrators was also developed. The curriculum logic map explicitly outlines the steps taken to implement the reading and mathematics curricula used within Empowerment Model schools.

Based on the historical performance of the Empowerment Model schools, it was important to assure that there was time allocated to accelerate the learning of students.
Therefore, all Empowerment Model schools implemented a daily 45 minute intervention period for reading and mathematics. The intervention period focused on providing an opportunity of learning and acceleration. This opportunity of learning and acceleration was viewed as a continuum so it was important to make sure there were materials to address deficiencies and capitalize on strengths. SRA Direct Instruction was purchased by the district to address deficiencies of student learning and Junior Great Books was purchased as a resource to be used with students who did not need the intervention. The purchase was made based on the research related to reading and mathematics interventions. To implement the programs, the appropriate components were identified and purchased that addressed the academic needs and strengths of the student population. A professional development plan for teachers, instructional coaches and administrators was also developed. The intervention logic map explicitly outlines the steps taken to implement the reading and mathematics interventions used within Empowerment Schools.

The Interventions Learning Pathways

The Intervention Learning Pathways (Appendix D) was the Reading and Mathematics intervention guide. The goal of the pathways was to provide a teacher-friendly tool that appropriately and effectively informed and guided the decision making process of teachers when determining instructional supports for students. The Learning Pathways identified all of the Reading and Mathematics interventions used within Empowerment Schools. The guide informed teachers what the appropriate interventions were for each grade and content area. It also informed teachers how to observe students
to determine who should be assessed, how to assess the student and identify the appropriate starting point. Lastly, it informed teachers where the intervention supports began at each grade, how to appropriately exit students from the intervention and provide accelerated learning opportunities for students.

The Empowerment Learning Pathways was developed by me as part of my responsibilities in the Office of Empowerment Schools Support (OESS). I was the architect of the learning pathways, creating the overall design of the product, identifying the instructional focus and developing the instructional framework. McGraw Hill assisted in the development, providing technical assistance related to the appropriate identification of interventions and exiting students from interventions. McGraw Hill was also responsible for the mass production and packaging of the product. The customized tool was developed based on the interventions and enrichment instructional tools used within Empowerment Schools. In addition to the core and supplemental curriculum changes, there were three personnel changes made to align with how Empowerment Model schools would be monitored and supported.

Every Empowerment School was staffed with at least one School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS). The role of the SBIS was to support the implementation of the Empowerment Instructional Model and provide direct support to the teaching staff. The addition of the SBIS to the school staff was paramount to the success of the Empowerment model. The SBIS served as a catalyst for all initiatives of the model. They were responsible for providing the professional development on all core and supplemental instructional components to the staff within their. They also played a major
role in monitoring the model and supporting the development of the staff within their school. The second personnel change was the School Improvement Specialist (SIS).

The SISs are central office coaches who were responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the Empowerment Model and coaching the SBISs. The SIS was an integral part of the Empowerment Model because they served as a liaison between the school and central office. Also, the SIS provided immediate monitoring and feedback from schools essential to effective implementation of the Empowerment model. The final change was the use of national consultants to provide support at the school level.

The national consultants were individuals employed by the publishing company that developed the intervention and curriculum materials in the areas of reading and mathematics being used in Empowerment Schools. The national consultants from the company assisted in the development and implementation of the professional development plan. Working collaboratively with the national consultants assured the appropriate materials were purchased and the design of the professional development was tailored to meet the needs and messaging of the district.

Philadelphia Do Now!

Historically, SDP schools purchased test preparation materials in hopes to improve student performance on the PSSA. The materials purchased were mirrored after the framework and problems students are likely to encounter on the PSSA. However, the materials purchased did not strategically and specifically target the school’s academic
needs based on their student achievement data. Nor did they provide teachers with support and guidance about how they should reteach the deficient skill.

The Philadelphia Do Now! (Appendix E) is a skill development and test taking strategy program that was developed in conjunction with the Office of Empowerment Schools Support (OESS) and Voyager Learning. OESS was the architect of the test taking strategy program, creating the overall design of the product, identifying the instructional focus and developing the instructional framework. Voyager Learning assisted in the development of items to address the instructional areas of focus and was responsible for the mass production and packaging of the product. The customized tool was developed based on the instructional deficiencies exhibited by students in Empowerment Schools on the Pennsylvania Standardized State Assessment (PSSA). The goal of the program was to provide a teacher-friendly format tool that optimized instructional time and reinforced key assessment anchors taught during core instruction.

The purpose of the Philadelphia Do Now! was to provide students in Empowerment Schools with the opportunity to be retaught and practice the skills where there was a demonstrated deficiency on the PSSA. Students received explicit instruction on the identified skills and learned critical strategies needed to build and improve their reading and math foundation. Key test-taking strategies were modeled, taught and practiced by students to internalize and apply when taking the PSSA. Students also learned and practiced constructed response items for reading and open-ended response items for math.
The Philadelphia Do Now! program consisted of five modules. The first module provided a 7-week Start-Up to review and practiced basic reading and math skills; it provided instruction in the reading and math skills that students typically need review. Three of the modules focused on the identified critical skills and test-taking strategies to prepare students for success on the state test. The finale modules consisted of two practice tests to measure student progress and provide a simulated testing environment to build student confidence. These five modules, based on the assessment anchors for each grade, ensured that Philadelphia students using the program received comprehensive customized instruction to build the skills necessary for success in future reading and math courses and on the PSSA.

Phase 3: Monitoring

The monitoring phase consisted of two artifacts: the development of a comprehensive assessment model and the development of the Academic Support Team (AST).
Comprehensive Assessment Model

If the high needs schools are going to have academic success, their ability to use data to monitor the instructional program is essential. The Comprehensive Assessment Model (Appendix F) was developed to outline for schools the appropriate and effective use of data.

To establish an effective learning environment teachers must know how to identify students in need, collect information to support the development of academic planning for struggling students, monitor the progress of the struggling students and assess the effectiveness of the support provided. The implementation of the Comprehensive Assessment Model within the Empowerment Model schools assists teachers in measuring learning outcomes and objectives. The data-driven decision-making process consists of the following elements: identification of the assessment, purpose and potential outcomes of the assessment, root cause analysis, identification of targeted instructional strategy and or intervention, monitoring tool and evidence of effectiveness. Teachers learned these skills and concepts through the professional development modules that facilitated by the Empowerment Office and the SBIS at the school.

The Comprehensive Assessment Model minimizes the opportunities to inappropriately use assessments. This is important because assessments are one of the major ways to determine effectiveness, i.e., if outcomes are met. The ability to appropriately measure outcomes increases the likelihood that the necessary supports are provided and midcourse corrections are made.
Academic Support Teams

The SDP did not have a formalized process to monitor and support the academic programs within its schools. Walkthroughs were conducted in SDP schools, but they were informally done, often in isolation to anything else happening at the school.

A more formalized support and monitoring process was necessary for the Empowerment Model to be successful. This would help assure that the design of the model was being implemented with fidelity and would support the Empowerment Office in providing targeted support to the high needs schools. In addition, it would contribute to the continued development of common language and understanding regarding the expected academic model and instructional expectations for Empowerment Model schools. Finally, it would provide Empowerment Model schools with a clear line of communication in reference to deliverables and support.

The Academic Support Team (AST) (Appendix G) was school support teams that monitored the implementation of the academic model of Empowerment Schools by conducting walkthroughs in the schools. The walkthroughs focused on the core and supplemental instructional initiatives that were being used within the high needs schools. The AST first collected data related to fidelity of implementation and instructional strengths and weaknesses and then developed a course of action to support the area(s) of need. The information collected by the team was also used to determine the level of program specific support and resources needed at the school.
Phase 4: Communicating with Parents and Students

The final phase produced one artifact, the Empowerment Model schools brochure (Appendix H). The proposed changes that were going to occur in the Empowerment Schools were entirely different from what was happening in the schools up to that point. Therefore, it was important to engage and communicate with the parents, students and the community. This brochure was developed with the parent and student in mind. Too often educational materials are given to parents with language and information that is foreign to them, which makes it difficult for parents to relate and see the value of what is being provided. The brochure provided an overview of the Empowerment Model. It informed parents and students about the goals of the model, the school environment and the staff. It also informed parents and students about the resources that were a part of the model to benefit and support parents and students. Lastly, it outlined all of the sports and extracurricular activities that will be available to any student attending an Empowerment Model school.
Chapter 4

IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES RESULTS

Based on my research of best practices to improve high needs schools, it was important for changes to occur in the district’s organizational structure, instructional program, professional development, and monitoring and support for high needs schools. As part of the Empowerment Model, the district addressed all four as described below.

Improvements in Organizational Structure

The superintendent first created the Office of Empowerment Schools Support (OESS). OESS was created to guide the design and implementation of the Empowerment Model. OESS was the direct contact for high needs schools and OESS was responsible for providing the professional development and support to teachers and principals within the high needs schools. The establishment and purpose of OESS was a major shift in the culture and daily operations of the district when it came to supporting schools.

Typically, schools did not have a seat at the table or a voice in the conversation when central office made decisions about what should be happening at schools. Although
the Empowerment Model effort was centralized, OESS worked to establish and gain the trust of the K-8 schools and include them in the decision making as much as possible.

In addition, high needs schools take the same approach as the other schools within the district when they have an issue: determine the correct office to contact to possibly address the issue. This often led to delays tied down in bureaucratic red tape. Once OESS was established, it handled all issues and concerns for the high needs schools, regardless of the area. The schools brought an issue to our attention and OESS did the leg work and resolved the matter.

Improvements in Instructional Program

In addition to the new office, core curriculum and intervention materials were purchased for the high needs schools. The SDP purchased Imagine It! as the reading curricula and Prentice Hall as the mathematics curricula for the Empowerment Model schools. Imagine It! was chosen based on the research related to improving students reading abilities. The design of this reading curriculum appropriately addressed all of the key indicators outlined in the NRP study. It provided students with more explicit instruction and had much stronger literacy development components, engaging students in best practices when it came to developing phonemic awareness skills and phonics. It also explicitly taught one high level comprehension strategies daily.

Prentice Hall Mathematics was chosen as the mathematics curricula based on the research related to improving students’ mathematics abilities. The Prentice Hall
mathematics curricula appropriately addressed all of the key elements identified within the research. Prentice Hall also placed a heavy emphasis on supporting classroom teachers. There were extensive professional development resources available to the teacher on-line to support their development and understanding of mathematics content. This program provided the appropriate balance of teaching for conceptual understanding, developing children's procedural literacy, and promoting strategic competence through meaningful problem-solving investigations. There were more hands-on opportunities, examples and more in-depth explanations of concepts.

To implement both the reading and mathematics curricula a professional development plan for teachers, instructional coaches and administrators was also developed. The curriculum logic model explicitly outlines the steps taken to implement the reading and mathematics curricula used within Empowerment Schools.

SRA Direct Instruction was purchased by the district based on the research related to reading and mathematics interventions. A professional development plan for teachers, instructional coaches and administrators was also developed. The intervention logic model explicitly outlines the steps taken to implement the reading and mathematics interventions used within Empowerment Schools. All Empowerment Model schools implemented a daily 45 minute intervention period for reading and mathematics using the SRA Direct Instruction resources and the district closely monitored schools’ implementation of this program. This was an added improvement for schools because the interventions being used were a direct reflection of data and the students’ needs. Another
major plus was the dedicated time. Schools had the needed time and opportunity to support students. This also allowed the school the opportunity to provide enrichment for students did not need the intervention.

The Philadelphia Do Now! was developed and distributed to all Empowerment Model schools. This tool replaced all test preparation resources previously used by the schools. The Philadelphia Do Now! addressed the reading and mathematics deficiencies identified in the high needs schools PSSA data. All schools completed one lesson in reading and mathematics each day. The schools also used the data from the daily lesson and the practice tests to measure improvement and identify instructional areas in need of continued support.

Improvements in Professional Development

The professional development framework implemented by the Empowerment Model was an improvement over past district practice for several reasons. It provided sustained ongoing professional development connected to practice. It focused on teaching key and specific academic content and strategies. It also provided clear and specific deliverables and outcomes.

Historically, SDP professional development occurred in the beginning of the year and during a few professional development days scattered throughout the school year. The Empowerment Model provided professional development on a weekly basis. The SBIS received weekly training on the various programs and strategies being used with in Empowerment Schools. All Empowerment Model schools instituted weekly grade group
meetings, which provided the opportunity and time for school-based training on the programs and strategies. Another major shift in the professional development model was the onsite professional development provided by publishing companies and central office staff.

Prior to the Empowerment Model publishing company consultants and central office staff provided training in a central location and never actually observed the program being implemented. The Empowerment Model changed that approach. Publishing company consultants were visiting schools after providing the professional development. This allowed them to observe teachers implementing the program and provide them with immediate feedback and modeling of effective implementation and practice.

The Empowerment Model schools professional development model focused on communicating the expected outcomes and deliverables. During the training deliverables for the week were identified and the evidence that should be collected was determined. This helped focus the schools and the individuals providing the support at the schools.

An SBIS was assigned to each Empowerment School to provide instructional support to teachers in reading and math. Professional development was provided to the SBISs to prepare them to implement the core and supplemental instructional programs within the schools and develop the teaching staff within the school. The professional development consisted of sustained ongoing training that occurred weekly in a central location as well as at their school site. The professional development was facilitated by
the publishing company consultants and the SISs form OESS. The SBIS received professional development in core reading and mathematics programs and all intervention programs from the publishers. The school-based professional development provided the SBISs with strategies for modeling implementation of the core and intervention instructional programs and giving feedback to teachers.

Given the pivotal role played by the SBISs in supporting classroom teachers, it was important to determine if their professional development being provided was effective. Six SBISs were interviewed about their daily functions and responsibilities, effectiveness in their position and supports received as an SBIS (Artifact I). These evaluation data provide valuable feedback to inform subsequent professional development programs for the SBISs.

The purpose of the evaluation of the School Based Instructional Specialist SRA Professional Development (Appendix J) was to determine the effectiveness of the SRA professional development program, i.e., were the SBISs able to implement the school-wide intervention in reading and math after receiving professional development. The evaluation focused on professional development and implementation of the intervention. The SBISs completed a survey that gathered their feedback on the benefit, preparation, and effectiveness of the Reading SRA professional development. Walkthrough checklists were completed by central office staff during site visits to the 71 elementary and middle Empowerment Schools; the checklist consisted focused on the implementation of the
SRA Reading intervention, including materials, scheduling, appropriate use of materials and class size.

The results of the survey administered to SBISs and the walkthrough checklist completed by central office staff during the visits to the schools confirmed that the program was implemented with fidelity and the professional development provided was effective. The survey administered to the 71 elementary and middle SBISs underscored the importance and effectiveness of the consultants. The ability to dialogue with the consultants and obtain feedback was viewed as invaluable. They seemed to attribute a lot of their understanding and their ability to implement the programs with fidelity to the unlimited access to the consultants. This really speaks to the importance of clearly defining support and making sure it is accessible. The SBISs had an overall positive feeling about the SRA professional development and the role it played in their ability to meet the expectations of implementation, particularly related to performing certain tasks related to implementation. Although numbers stayed relatively favorable, they did drop significantly when asked about their ability to perform certain tasks with their assigned teachers. This was evident when comparing the survey and checklist results.

The walk-through checklist was completed during site visits to the 71 Elementary and Middle Empowerment Model schools. A checklist was completed for each school. In total, 1,187 classrooms were visited and about half (52 percent) of the schools were on the appropriate lesson. Almost all classrooms visited (98 percent) had less than 25 students in the classes, almost all teachers (94 percent) were using the script, almost all
students (95 percent) had workbooks, and almost all schools visited (94 percent) had the intervention in the designated classrooms and at the designated time. These findings suggest that schools were able to more closely adhere to logistical issues (i.e., number of students assigned to classroom, delivering the intervention in designated classrooms at designated times) than to the instructional expectations and fidelity of the programs. When comparing the walk-through findings to the survey findings, the results demonstrated the SBIS felt more comfortable with logistical expectations of the implementation process. They were able to train teachers to use the script and provide the materials to the students during the class, but when it came to the actual implementation of the program there was a noticeable difference. Many said they felt they could demonstrate pacing and signaling, which are critical to the fidelity of the program. However, when the schools were visited, many teachers were not on the appropriate lesson. Based on the survey and checklist results the training seems to be very effective, but the walk-through demonstrated a need to spend more time on implementation, particularly lesson pacing. The SBIS interviews also demonstrated the professional development was a positive component of the model.

The responses of the SBISs during their interviews demonstrated the support and professional development provided to SBISs was effective. All that were interviewed voiced two similar purposes to their work. First, they all spoke about how they were there to improve the instructional practice; helping good teachers become better teachers, or developing and supporting the struggling teacher. Second, they were there to improve the academic outcome of their school. This demonstrates that OESS did a good job of
articulating and explaining its role and purpose of the position. The responses provided by the SBSISs regarding their daily functions and responsibilities aligned to what the expectations and purpose of the position were, improving the academic performance of the school and developing the teachers within the school.

When discussing their effectiveness in the position, all interviewed thought they were very effective in their positions and their ability to provide the expected services and supports to the teachers within their school. Many noted that teachers sought them out for support and guidance on how to appropriately and effectively implement curriculum materials. They all spoke about how their ability to establish relationships was critical to their effectiveness. The responses provided during the interviews suggest that the collegial relationships improved within their buildings and the desire to improve instructionally improved.

Lastly, the SBSISs rated the professional development they received very high. There were several big takeaways from the professional development. The first was the facilitator is important to how the professional development is perceived. If the person does not present him or herself to be knowledgeable it impacts the credibility and effectiveness of the professional development. The SBISs appreciated that the trainers were national consultants who were able to talk about the programs from experience and practice. They also expressed that they were a part of the process. The professional development was not happening to them. The professional development being provided was based on their feedback and needs. The biggest takeaway of all was the on-site
professional development. All felt this was really valuable because it provided for immediate opportunities for modeling and feedback to teachers from the consultants. It also confirmed what was being voiced by SBISs and supported their continued development.

**Improvements in Monitoring and Support**

The monitoring and support framework implemented as a part of the Empowerment Model was an improvement over the usual district model because it provided a systemic and sustained approach to monitoring and supporting schools academically. It developed common language and understanding regarding academic outcomes and the effectiveness of programs, supports and services. It also provided an efficient and succinct way to collect and analyze data collected during walkthroughs.

The district did not have a formalized process to monitor and support the academic programs within its schools. The SDP conducted walkthroughs in schools, but they were informally done, often in isolation to anything else happening at the school. The monitoring and support component of the Empowerment Model clearly defined the purpose, frequency and expectation of the schools as well as central office. The Academic Support Team (AST) provided a cycle of support for the Empowerment Model schools. The cycle of support included three steps: a walkthrough, communication of the findings and a plan for the provision of support to the school in the identified areas of need. Schools clearly understood the purpose of the walkthroughs, how frequently they would occur, how the information collected would be utilized and reported and how they
would be supported based as a result of the walkthrough. In addition to the process common language and understand was also improved.

As a part of the Empowerment Model we wanted to make sure that all stakeholders had the same understanding when it came to defining support, services and programs. This was accomplished by using all 13 offices from the Chief Academic Office, SBISs and principals to create the teams. The teams were then trained on how to appropriately monitor the academic programs being used within Empowerment Model schools. The training provided the team members with clear descriptions, expectations and definitions of the various components. The training also defined instructional practices and strategies that may be observed during walkthroughs. The final improvement was in the area of data collection.

Prior to the implementation of the framework used as a part of the Empowerment Model data from the walkthrough was collected manually. Staff members were able to analyze the current data, but it was difficult to establish trends or compare data over time within that particular school or over several schools. To enhance its ability to collect and analyze the data from walkthroughs, the SDP entered into a partnership with Teachscape. Teachscape is a school effectiveness company that provides on-line multimedia resources and designs professional learning experiences to raise the instructional level of teachers and student achievement. The tool used by the district was Classroom Walkthrough, which collects classroom observation data. Classroom Walkthrough technology can be added to most wireless handheld devices (e.g. iPad, iPhone, Palm, Blackberry, Windows
Mobile devices). Once uploaded, the data are shaped into reports and graphs to facilitate opportunities to examine the data, work towards a shared goal of improving instruction and boost student achievement. It also quickly identifies areas of strength and needed growth that can inform follow-up professional development.

The Empowerment Model made great improvements to the organizational structure, the instructional program, professional development and monitoring and support of the district. The aforementioned improvements were supported by the analysis of the evaluation data collected through surveys and interviews about the Empowerment Model.

Impact of Empowerment Schools on Non empowerment Schools

Being identified as an Empowerment school carried a stigma of failure. Schools did not want to be associated the model in any capacity. This mind set changed quickly amongst schools that were identified as Empowerment Schools once they began to receive supports and services, but non empowerment schools were not as ready to change their position. The Empowerment Model has many components, supports and services to aid the school in their continued development and improvement. As the Empowerment Schools started to experience success the non-empowerment schools were interested in reaping the benefits as well. It quickly went from not wanting to be affiliated with Empowerment Schools to attending professional development and requesting that staff within OESS provide professional development for the principals of the non-
empowerment schools. In particular the non-empowerment schools were very interested in participating and receiving professional development facilitated by the Office of Empowerment Schools (OESS). The non-empowerment schools also requested copies of the Philadelphia Do Now! to use with the student in their schools.
Chapter 5

REFLECTION ON IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES RESULTS

My goal was to design and implement a support model for high needs schools within the SDP and that was accomplished with the development and implementation of the Empowerment Model. The Empowerment Model addressed the needs identified by the historical data of the district and the preliminary audit. The Empowerment Model established its own identify and place within the district and was viewed as a direct support and crucial resource to the high needs schools. The overall approach was successful, but there were several aspects of the model that worked particularly well: support from the superintendent, the SBIS position, professional development, the appropriate identification and implementation of the reading and mathematics interventions and the support and monitoring model.

One of the major factors that allowed the goal of developing a support model for high needs schools to be met in the SDP was the support from the superintendent. Dr. Ackerman made sure that all understood the importance of the Empowerment Model and its role the overall improvement of the district. Dr. Ackerman was intimately involved and invested in the Empowerment Model. She visited the schools, assisted in the
planning and delivery of professional development and analyzed the data of the Empowerment Model schools. Having the superintendent lead the conversation made all understand the importance and be engaged.

The SBIS position was successful because of the impact and influence it had on the instructional practice and teacher development within the building. The SBIS played a key role in the implementation of the new core and supplemental instructional materials. The SBIS provided direct support at the school level and served as the key contact when questions arose about the instructional materials within the building. Teachers within the Empowerment Schools saw the SBIS as a clear resource and a critical part of their personal growth and development. Additionally, teachers valued their expertise, knowledge and support.

The professional development model implemented within Empowerment Model schools was successful because it focused on all levels of personnel: teachers, administrators, SBISs and central office staff. All school and central office staff were trained in all components of the model as well as the entire core instructional and supplemental materials. This helped build a common language and understanding. Also, the professional development occurred regularly, was in alignment with the expectations of the model and the needs of the audience. Lastly, expectations and outcomes were clear and everyone felt prepared to meet them because of the continued and sustained professional development provided.
Identifying the appropriate reading and mathematics interventions and implementing them with fidelity was a great accomplishment. The approach taken as a part of the Empowerment Model established purpose, focus and a systematic way to identify the appropriate intervention to meet a particular student or a group of student’s needs. Prior to the Empowerment Model, there was very little governance or monitoring of the supplemental instructional materials and often they were not always implemented with fidelity. The system put in place as a result of the Empowerment Model clearly defined how to determine and address a student’s academic need. It also assured that the supports identified were implemented with fidelity, from materials to training to adequate time in the schedule. Most importantly, schools knew how to appropriately monitor and exit a student from an intervention based on data.

The monitoring and support model was also a positive highlight of the model. In addition to the structural changes described earlier, the Empowerment Model established the culture and importance of monitoring for the purpose of support. Our focus was on the desired outcomes so when we visited schools it was to identify any gaps or barriers that prohibited students and schools being successful. Additionally, a sense of cohesiveness and focus was established. OESS led the charge of establishing a singular focus and approach in central office when it came to supporting the high needs schools. The high needs schools were no longer receiving mixed messages and multiple initiatives without the support or guidance. OESS was the gate keeper for the high needs schools, assuring the communication was clear and the necessary support and services were being provided.
Nevertheless, some of the schools did not share this viewpoint from the beginning. Dr. Ackerman believed that these schools had lost their right to make decisions regarding their schools’ instructional practices and approach because of their performance. This resulted in some schools not wanting to be a willing recipient of the supports and services being provided. Although we were able to win over the majority of the schools and their leadership, I believe that would have occurred much sooner if these schools did not view being labeled an Empowerment Model school as a punishment. In order to address these schools’ initial reluctance and concerns, I would definitely improve the public engagement strategy. I would improve it by making schools a part of the process from the beginning and communicating the purpose of the model more clearly and succinctly. In a large district, decisions are typically made by the few instead of the masses. Although I understand why this needs to occur, I believe that allowing them to be a part of the conversation improves the buy-in of the schools.

Another component I would redesign is the professional development. Although it was strength of the model, there is still room for improvement. Typically the professional development was provided by position because it allowed a more targeted professional development tailored to the needs of a particular audience in relation to the particular initiative. Although that worked well, I believe that if we had provided professional development to all positions together (i.e., teachers, SBSISs and principals) we would have been able to increase the common language and understanding dramatically. By having them receive the professional development collectively the purpose and roles would have been explained to all, which would have showed how they all work together.
for one common goal. Also, the information would have come from one place at the same
time, allowing for all of the questions and responses to be heard at once.

I would also increase the time of on-site professional development and coaching
because this approach was valued the most by the teaching staff and had a great impact
on improving and changing teacher practice. Prior to the Empowerment Model,
publishing company consultants and/or central office staff did not visit schools to see if
what was learned in the professional development was implemented with fidelity and if
not, provide the support necessary to improve practice. To improve practice we must see
it in action and the only way to do that is to be where it is taking place, in the classroom.
This enabled teachers to be observed using the materials and receive feedback on the
spot. This was critical because it provided the opportunity for immediate support,
reflection and effective change of practice. This was the probably the strongest and most
liked aspect of the model. All who had the opportunity to experience this viewed this as
very powerful.

Although the model provided a structure that addressed many of deficiencies
raised during the audit I believe that we did not adequately address the area of school
leadership and sustainability. Although we provided professional development for
principals, it primarily focused on building their understanding of the programs used
within Empowerment Model Schools. I felt that we should have spent more time
developing the principal’s instructional leadership skills, particularly in the area of
teacher development. Many are able to identify weaknesses in teachers’ instruction, but
do not know how to effectively address and resolve these shortcomings. This was critical flaw in the Empowerment Model support because principals, especially in schools staffed with young teachers really need to know how to appropriately and effectively develop and support teachers.

I also believe that we did not spend enough time discussing and planning how to sustain the model. As the model experienced success the leadership of the district continued to expand the role and responsibilities of the model and the OESS. Sustainability was not in the forefront of the conversation because the focus was on improving the schools. There were preliminary conversations and attempts to address sustainability by developing an exit and transition process for Empowerment Model schools that had demonstrated the necessary level of improvement. However, this did not address as a district how we would build capacity internally so we could continue to provide the supports, services and resources for the long term. There was very little discussion about how we could assume services being provided by outside vendors to minimize cost. There was minimal conversation about training and developing other departments within central office so they are able to implement the best practices instituted by OESS to support and improve schools.

Recommendations for Other Districts

Based on my experience, there are several recommendations I would make to a district looking to develop a support model for their high needs schools. The first would be to focus on appropriately diagnosing the problem. Do not make any decisions about
what to do until the problem is fully understood. It is important to immerse oneself in what research says are best practices to address the problem.

My second recommendation is not to invest in any programs, curriculum, professional development, or other resources without understanding what the district/school already has and data on the effectiveness on any new purchases. When districts are trying to improve schools they sometimes think that the answer is purchasing a new product. However, what I learned is that often it is not the product but the people implementing the product. Things seem to fail predominately because of the lack of implementation with fidelity. A strong professional development and monitoring model is essential. The people on the ground need to know what is expected and feel confident in meeting the expectation. This is accomplished by providing teachers and administrators with continuous and sustained job embedded professional development and monitoring implementation.

In addition, I have several recommendations to the SDP regarding the support model for high needs schools. The first is to develop a sustainability plan. Too often in large urban districts things start, but don’t always finish. Initiatives are often tied to leadership and fall by the wayside when there is a change in leadership. Although Empowerment Model Schools improved, there is still a long way to go. The high needs schools should remain a focus regardless of who the superintendent is.

Another recommendation is to increase the internal capacity of the organization to provide some of the services and supports to minimize the financial burden. A critical
goal is to continue to develop people within the district to be able to provide the supports and services needed within the high needs schools. The continued development of the district’s own staff increases the institutional knowledge and expertise within the organization that, in turn, builds the needed supports and services to maintain and continue the improvement of schools readily available.

My last recommendation is to establish some kind of incentive to entice skilled teachers and administrators to work in underperforming schools. Many skilled staff do not want to work in a low performing school. Most feel they have paid their dues, which results in these schools being staffed with the least experienced teachers and administrators. High needs schools face the most challenges and require the most experienced staff.
Chapter 6

REFLECTION ON LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Being a student in the ADPO program had a positive impact on my development as a scholar, problem solver and partner. As a scholar my skills improved in the area of research, writing and critical thinking. Prior to becoming a student in the program I accessed research and was familiar with some of the best practices being applied in education, but I learned that I was not truly exploring the research. Learning how to better access research enabled me to provide a clearer rationale and purpose for the decisions I was making in my daily job responsibilities. My understanding grew on how to sift through information by knowing what key words to use in a literature search or knowing where to search to get the information I am looking for. Knowing how to navigate and attain the desired information has been truly beneficial.

As a result of the program I have learned to be more succinct and clear with my writing. Educators sometimes have the tendency to use educator lingo because that is typically their audience. However, that type of writing can sometimes be murky and unclear. This program has taught me to be thoughtful in my writing. It is important to make sure that the message is clear and accomplishes the desired outcome.
I always viewed myself as a person who thought critically. I am very analytical by nature, looking at and considering every variable and possible outcome. However, this program helped me to enhance that skill even more. I was introduced to new concepts and added new layers to my perspective. It allowed me to connect the dots on an even larger and broader scale.

As a problem solver, the ADPO program enhanced my skills in the areas of alignment, planning and implementation. Throughout my professional career I have been viewed as a problem solver and being a part of the ADPO program only improved those skills. One of the more powerful concepts that helped me improve in this area was logic maps. I always thought in a sequential and analytical manner, but logic maps assisted in me in the area of planning and implementation. It showed me how to slowdown and engage others in resolving problems. It also made me think of every possible scenario and plan for those possibilities. Most importantly, it allowed me to really focus on the outcomes and assure the steps being taken would meet the desired outcomes.

I also learned how to better present information and solutions. Understanding, analyzing and applying data are areas I excel in, but that is not a strength everyone possesses. The biggest takeaway for me in this area was to only provide what is necessary and in its simplest format possible.

As a partner, the ADPO improved my skills in the areas of leadership and engagement. Studying the elements of effective leadership and the various leadership styles made me a more thoughtful leader. I found myself thinking more critically,
thinking about problems and solutions more globally. My growth in the area of leadership also assisted me in my ability to develop my own staff. I was continuously turning around and applying what I learned with my staff, which made my department function more efficiently. The biggest improvement was my ability to be politically savvy. Prior to the program I had a negative view on “politics”; I thought I was being a better person because I didn’t engage in politics. However, by not engaging I was not having the impact or influence on the decisions being made.

One of the most influential concepts I learned during my experience in the program was the public engagement strategy. This strategy was valuable because it was all encompassing. It focused on understanding the environment in which one is working and the needs, desires and expectations of the audience. Most normally gravitate to the external stakeholders, but internal stakeholders are just as critical in public engagement. This strategy also makes one focus on being resolution-oriented, but accomplishment of this requires a level of political savvy. The public engagement strategy was really a problem solving and implementation strategy.
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Appendix A

PROBLEM STATMENT

Underperforming Schools Trying to Move Forward

Introduction

The 2007-2008 Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) test results for School District of Philadelphia (SDP) showed a record sixth consecutive year of growth in mathematics and reading scores. Mathematics scores rose 4.1 percentage points over last year, or 29.5 percentage points since 2002, and reading scores rose 4.2 percentage points or 20.9 percentage points since 2002. PSSA results reported by student groups also showed increases in all categories when reported by race/ethnicity, students with disabilities, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged students. The percentage of students scoring Below Basic, which is the lowest performance level, continued to decline. In reading the numbers declined by 4.0 percentage points and mathematics by 2.7 percentage points. As the eighth largest urban district the gains illustrated by the SDP shows great promise, but are they enough; 55.2% of the students are not proficient on the PSSA in reading and 51% are not proficient in mathematics.
When you begin to look at the results school by school, the overall gains as a district do not seem that significant.

There are 266 schools in the district. There are 85 schools within the district categorized with the most severe AYP status of Corrective Action I (CAI) or Corrective Action II (CAII). A school’s AYP status determines the level of support they are eligible for as well as actions the district and or state may take to improve student achievement. Corrective Action is defined as a school or school district that does not make yearly progress for four or more consecutive years. Corrective Action II signifies a school has not made AYP for at least five consecutive years. Corrective Action I schools are eligible for various levels of technical assistance and are subject to escalating consequences (e.g., changes in curriculum, leadership, professional development). Corrective Action II schools are eligible for the same types of technical assistance, but they also are subject to governance changes such as reconstitution, chartering, and privatization.

**Problem Definition**

There are too few schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress within the School District of Philadelphia. The district has tried to provide to support to the high needs schools within the district, but currently there is not a clear and consistent model of support for high need schools. The SDP has a new Superintendent and is currently under a massive reorganization to align with the mission and vision of the current leadership. One of the major initiatives of the new administration is The Empowerment Schools
initiative. The Empowerment School initiative is the Superintendent’s vision for supporting high need schools within the district. Through the use of student performance data the Superintendent identified 85 schools as high need. My goal is to design and implement a support model for high need schools.

**Purpose of the Inquiry**

I will examine the process of developing a model, identifying and providing supports and services to high need schools. The schools are in a position to receive an abundance of resources to help raise student achievement, but it is not clear what the model of support will be and how it will be implemented at the school level. This inquiry is intended to assist with the development of a systemic, sustained, and equitable process to appropriately implement, monitor, and adapt the supports and services provided to high need schools.

**Improvement Goal**

Listed below are the improvement goals that will be attained as a result of the inquiry

1. Framework of support for high need schools
2. Academic interventions for reading and mathematics to support struggling students within the high need schools
3. Support and monitoring framework for high need schools
4. Professional development framework for school based instructional support staff
Key Questions, Objectives, Tasks

Question #1

What is a specific area of need within the School District of Philadelphia and what is a potential solution?

Rationale:

- Develop a solution for an area of need

Type of artifact associated with question: Problem Statement

Question 2

What is a current model being utilized to support student learning and achievement that could have an impact on high need schools?

Rationale:

- Determine impact of monitoring system
- Identify research based best practices
- Impact of external and external support

Type of artifact associated with question: Comprehensive Assessment Model

Question 3

What do School Based Instructional Specialists (SBIS) say about the supports received and their experience as an SBIS?

Rationale:

- Determining areas of strength and growth
- Determining effectiveness of supports provided to SBISs

Type of artifact associated with question: SBIS Interviews
Question 4

What do School Based Instructional Specialists say about the implementation and training related to the intervention being used in high need schools

Rationale:

- Effectiveness of training for coaches
- Assess implementation model
- Determine adaptations of supports and services

Type of artifact associated with question: SRA Implementation Survey

Question 5

How will the supports and services be introduced and communicated to parents and students attending the high need schools?

Rationale:

- Informing parents and students about the design of the high need schools
- Benefit of the new model

Type of artifact associated with question: Develop Overview document

Question 6

How will it be determined if the model is being implemented with fidelity, the instructional tools are supported and monitored within the high need schools?

Rationale:

- Determine impact on student learning
- Determine impact on implementation
- Professional development models

Type of artifact associated with this question: Develop cycle of support
Question 7

What is the most effective professional development model for instructional coaches providing supports and services to underperforming schools?

Rationale:

- Determine impact on coach pedagogy and content knowledge
- Determine professional development model
- Impact on teacher pedagogy and content knowledge

Type of artifact associated with this question: professional development model for coaches

Question 8

What are the instructional goals of the Empowerment Model and the approach taken to achieve them?

Rationale:

- Determine impact on student learning
- Effectiveness of social network
- Determine professional development model
- Impact on teacher pedagogy and content knowledge

Type of artifact associated with this question: Logic Models

Question 9

What guides the decision making process regarding student’s placement and exiting interventions?

Rationale:

- Determine impact on student learning
- Determine professional development model

Type of artifact associated with this question: Instructional Pathways
Question 10

What does research identify as best practice when developing a model to support high need schools?

Rationale:

- Establish clear method of support for high need schools
- Identify supports and services for high need schools
- Determine impact on student learning
- Determine professional development model
- Impact on teacher pedagogy and content knowledge

Type of artifact associated with this question: Literature Review
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IDENTIFYING BEST PRACTICES AND EFFECTIVE REFORM EFFORTS:
IMPROVING HIGH NEED SCHOOLS ON A LARGE SCALE

Harold S. Brady
ADPO Ed.D. Candidate
School of Education
University of Delaware
In 2008 the Empowerment Model was introduced as a component of the School District of Philadelphia’s (SDP) strategic plan to support high need schools. The Empowerment Model would provide support, resources and services in the areas of instruction, leadership, student and family support and operations. The intent and purpose of the resources and services would be to provide structured support and guidance to implement best practices that have a positive impact on teaching and learning. This would be accomplished by modeling and training the leadership and staff within the schools, ultimately preparing the school staff and leadership for autonomy, independence and academic success. The purpose of this paper is to identify current research, best practices and strategies that could assist in guiding improvement efforts and the design and development of the Empowerment Model that will be implemented in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP).
Introduction

The dominant strategy for school reform has been systemic reform: changes in standards, assessments, accountability, governance (charters and vouchers) and funding plans (O’Day & Smith, 1991). Smith and O’Day recommended this strategy of systemic structure, beginning at the state level, to support the efforts of schools in the area of teaching and learning. The framework was based on standards and outlined the expectations of student learning. It aligned policy to standards, reinforcing one another to provide guidance to schools and teachers regarding teaching and learning. The structure was in response to the previous disjointed “top down” and “down up” reform efforts. It combined elements of the previous reform efforts. It also provided clarity, alignment and informed states, schools and teachers of their roles and expectations. Smith and O’Day influenced the way states, schools and teachers viewed teaching and learning. This strategy of systemic reform initially introduced by Smith and O’Day is still the dominant strategy of today. For example, the educational community presented the Common Core Standards, which is a standards reform initiative. The Common Core Standards trimmed the standards in the area of reading and mathematics, identifying and embedding skills necessary for the 21st century learner. Another example of systemic assessment reform is currently being implemented in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania changed their large scale assessment and graduation requirement for high schools. Pennsylvania changed from the Pennsylvania Standard State Assessment (PSSA) to the Keystone Exams, which are content specific assessments, for high school students. In 2013, high school students will take content specifics tests in the areas of English,
Algebra, Biology and History. In addition, in 2017 students will not graduate high school if they have not passed the Keystone Exams. Although changes to policy, standards and assessments can have a positive impact, systemic reform has to be more than policy. It must also address practice that is utilized everyday by principals and teachers to meet the needs of students and improve learning.

While there are some benefits to improving educational policy and standards, teachers and principals need more. Teachers and principals also need assistance in identifying instructional materials and best practices. Teachers and principals identify proven instructional materials and practices through personal and or collegial experience. Typically, they will not conduct the extensive research to make an informed decision about “what works.” Their research is limited to a “local search,” of what is immediately available. Teachers and principals also need direct support to assist in the areas of fidelity of implementation and monitoring. To suit their own need or comfort level teachers and principals have a tendency to deviate from the prescribed method or approach prior to it being put in place, reducing the probability of effectiveness. Additionally, their methods of monitoring and measuring outcomes are not always aligned. Clear checkpoints are not established: the measurement lacks the needed depth and breadth, or they are not even monitoring or measuring what is happening. As a result, the desired outcome is not met and the program is viewed as a failure. Teachers and principals need on the ground support to better understand the importance and relationship of fidelity of implementation and student outcomes. The element missing is the “how”: the ground level support
assisting teachers and principals with transitioning the abstract to actual application and best practice.

The purpose and focus of this paper is to identify components and instructional practices within K-8 schools that could have a positive impact on improving high need schools. I am defining a high need school as a school who has the designation Corrective Action I or Corrective Action II. The two aforementioned designations are assigned to a school or district by the state of Pennsylvania when the school or district has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for at least four consecutive years. I explored the literature on research-based and best practices using an electronic database available through the University of Delaware Library. I searched in EBSCO Host using the phrase urban education in the search descriptor. I conducted a separate search utilizing the following key words: reading/intervention; mathematics/intervention; reading/professional development; math/professional development; centralized and decentralized. The table below shows the number of potential articles for review.

Table 8

*Articles for Review Based on Key Word Search*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Indicator</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Articles for Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>Reading and Intervention</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>Math and Intervention</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>Reading and Professional Development</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>Math and Professional Development</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>School Reform and Centralized</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>School reform and Decentralized</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I read the abstract of each article within each area and identified articles that focused on schools with low academic performance, students with a low socioeconomic status, implemented programs and practices across multiple schools and demonstrated a positive impact on instruction. As a result, 30 articles were identified meeting the aforementioned criteria. The articles shared some common themes that could support the initial efforts of a district trying to build and establish a model to support high need schools.

I will summarize what I learned by first identifying the themes essential to building and establishing a model of support for high need schools. I will present the findings of my literature review in four areas: instructional practice, professional development, programmatic support and monitoring. Lastly, I will make recommendations based on the literature.

**District Role in Improving High Need Schools**

The study, Beyond islands of Excellence: What Districts Can Do to Improve Instruction and Achievement in All Schools (Togneri & Anderson, 2003), stated that for school systems to become excellent, “Our nation has a moral imperative to close the achievement gap between low income students and their more advantaged peers…which will demand system wide approaches that touch every child in every school in every district across the nation” (p.1). One of the more consistent debates in the arena of school improvement focuses on what is the best approach to support and improve high need
schools. Should the decision-making process be centralized or decentralized? Districts are expected to provide the necessary resources to improve failing schools within their jurisdiction. As a result, initiatives are implemented from the top down, providing the schools within their district the expected pathway to school success. However, schools will contend the message is sometimes mixed from the district and the initiatives and directives are at times conflicting.

The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) examined the roles played by central staff members in shaping and supporting instructional reform in three large urban districts. The three districts are located in three different states and the enrollment ranges from 50,000 to 200,000. CPRE found that central office had a more objective and stronger commitment to research and evidence than the school based staff when it came to identifying programs. Although both parties used research, there seemed to be more of a comfort level by the central office staff. The teaching staff within the schools seemed to be more comfortable with what they found when it validated what they believed (Corcoran, Fuhrman and Belcher 2001). Too often schools and districts try to throw many things at the problem in hopes that something will stick, which causes them to be “a jack of all trades” but a “master of none.”

Focused goals and priorities are pivotal and only using instructional practices and resources that address them the best are critical (De la Torre, Allensworth, Jagesic, Sebastian and Salmonowicz, 2012). School based staff is most effective when their focus and resources are clear and systemic. This was evident with eight elementary schools in
Chicago. The eight schools utilized a turnaround model based on two different models. The first model was the essential supports model of the Consortium for Chicago School Research and the second was the Continuous Quality Improvement model adopted by organizations to reach and sustain high performance. The eight schools implemented the following strategies:

- **Shared leadership among principals, administrators, and grade level team teachers**
- **Onsite professional development and coaching for teachers and principals emphasizing instruction and teamwork**
- **Use of an eight step instructional model that aims for mastery learning, with weekly no-stakes assessments based on Illinois Achievement Standards**
- **Engagement of parents to learn the Illinois Standards and to better help their children with their homework**
- **School staff and parents jointly plan and apply a continuous improvement process, including a common instructional calendar**
- **Building trust and collaboration among all stakeholders within and across schools to accelerate learning and sharing among staff, students and parents to create a high performing learning community**
- **Solving problems schools can’t solve by themselves using a team comprised of teachers, principals, chief area officers and the chief of education officer**

By 2010 all eight schools were improving at a rate almost five times as faster than the average: 3.4 percentage points compared with .7 points in their K-8 schools in Chicago (Simmons, 2011).

Nevertheless, it is important for districts to have an inclusive approach when leading school improvement efforts. Districts must create an environment of shared ownership and responsibility with the individuals responsible for implementation. The adoption and effectiveness of any agenda is predicated on the understanding, involvement
and acceptance of the individuals responsible for implementation. No matter how effective or positive the results, it is mostly teachers’ acceptance of an instructional approach that determines the likelihood that it will continue to be used over time (Polloway, Bursuck, Jayanthi, Epstein, and Nelson, 1996).

In our society where immediate return is the rule and not the exception patience is not a liberty schools and districts feel they have. Too often schools and districts are looking for the immediate turn around, expecting schools to make dramatic gains the first year. The research is clear; effects are seen in the third through fifth year (De la Torre, et al, 2012). Districts have to commit to the development, planning and implementation of improving schools. Thinking through the process and basing decisions on research and best practice, doing what is essential and not what is popular.

Three themes have been emphasized in the literature in regard to the role of the district in improving schools. A district developing a support model for high need schools should consider the following: taking a centralized approach with shared ownership and responsibility with the school based staff; committing to utilizing research based practices; and committing to the identified and agreed upon programmatic and instructional practices long term to see the best results.
**Programmatic Changes**

Improving schools require various elements to work together for the betterment of the learning environment. Effective core and supplemental instructional materials, effective instructional practice, and professional development are three major elements critical to improving student achievement. To have success in identifying and implementing all three, it is essential to know not only what works, it is important to know what works in your environment.

**Improving Student Reading Abilities**

In 2008, 55.2% of the School District of Philadelphia students were not proficient in reading on the PSSA and 51% of the students were not proficient in mathematics on the PSSA. More than half of the students within the district were performing below the standard set by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This has been a longstanding trend within the school district. Table 1 illustrates the percentage of students who were not proficient from 2002 to 2008.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The National Reading Panel (NRP) provided Congress with a report in 2000, which focused its research and findings on five areas (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension) as key elements necessary when teaching reading (National Reading Panel (US) and National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (US), 2000). Listed below are some of the key findings and recommendations for districts and schools as they choose reading curricula:

- Explicitly and systematically teaching children Phonemic Awareness (PA) is most effective. Additionally, working to enhance Phonemic Awareness in reading and spelling works best in small groups: engaging in exercises where children manipulate phonemes with letters and the instruction is focused on one or two types of phoneme manipulations rather than multiple types.

- Systematic phonics instruction produces significant benefits for students in kindergarten through 6th grade, especially for children having difficulty learning to read. It also significantly improves children’s word recognition, spelling, and reading comprehension.

- Systematic synthetic phonics instruction, which is the isolated teaching of sounds associated with letters and then blending together, has a positive and significant effect on disabled readers’ reading skills, on students with learning disabilities as well as low-achieving students who are not diagnosed with a learning disability.

- There is not a positive relationship between programs and instruction that encourage large amounts of independent reading and improvements in reading achievement, including fluency.

- Vocabulary instruction does lead to gains in comprehension and is most effective when taught both directly and indirectly utilizing multiple methods. Methods that enhance the attainment of vocabulary are repetition and multiple exposures to vocabulary, learning in rich contexts, incidental learning, and use of computer technology.

- Comprehension is improved when students are explicitly taught specific comprehension strategies to use when they are having difficulty understanding what they are reading. There are six text comprehension strategies labeled as the most effective: comprehension monitoring, use of graphic and semantic organizers, question answering, question generation, story structure and summarization.
Explicit instruction provides the best opportunity for student learning. The steps of explicit instruction are direct explanation, modeling, guided practice and application.

Additional studies that supported the findings of this study are Levin (2010) and Benner, Nelson, Stage and Ralston (2011).

**Improving Student Mathematics Abilities**

Unlike in reading there were not any meta-analysis studies that specifically and explicitly stated what makes a good mathematics program. However, the literature did provide insight on how mathematics should be taught, what good mathematics instruction should look like and the need to improve the quality and knowledge of mathematics teachers.

There are two clear approaches when discussing how mathematics should be taught. The two instructional approaches are skills-based instruction and problem solving. The two have completely different approaches and expectations. With a skills-based instructional approach the teacher focuses on developing computational skills and recall of facts. With a problem solving instructional approach teachers push students to explain how they arrived at a solution and expect students to try to identify multiple ways of solving a problem. When considering instructional practices educators sometimes draw lines in the sand, choosing a side and philosophy to follow. However, balance is the key to effective instruction. Grouws (2004) suggests it is not necessary for teachers to focus first on skill development and then move on to problem solving; both can be done together. Teachers can also develop skills on an as-needed basis, or use technology to
supplement the development of skills. In addition, there is evidence that if students are initially drilled too much on isolated skills, they have a harder time making sense of them later.

Three critical components were identified to provide effective mathematics instruction. (Cobb and Jackson, 2011; Shellard and Moyer, 2002) The three components are teaching for conceptual understanding, developing children's procedural literacy, and promoting strategic competence through meaningful problem-solving investigations.

Conceptual understanding refers to the comprehension of mathematical concepts, operations, and relations. Knowing what mathematical symbols, diagrams and procedures mean enables students to connect ideas to what they already know. Two benefits of building conceptual understanding are that it supports retention and prevents common errors (National Research Council Mathematics, 2001).

Developing a student’s procedural fluency is defined as the skill to carry out procedures flexibly, accurately, efficiently, and appropriately. Whether the student is solving the problem mentally or on paper, the student knows how to apply the procedures flexibly, accurately, efficiently and appropriately. The benefit is that it can strengthen and develop math understanding and make it easier to acquire new mathematics skills (National Research Council Mathematics, 2001).

Promoting strategic competence through meaningful problem solving investigations is the ability to formulate, represent and solve mathematical problems. The
student is able to formulate and represent problems mathematically and develop a strategy to solve the problem using concepts and procedures appropriately. To solve a problem a student must follow a solution method and adjust accordingly. The student would also need to understand the quantities in the problem and their relationship and the computing skills required to solve the problem (National Research Council Mathematics, 2001).

Effective mathematics instruction starts with effective teaching. The ability of the teacher greatly impacts the outcome of student learning. Grouws (2004) talked about effective instructional practices and the role of the teacher. He spoke to the importance of the quality of implementation of teaching practices and how it greatly influences student learning. He also spoke about the value of using manipulative materials to investigate a concept. Not only on whether manipulatives are used, but how they are used with the students. He also spoke about the benefit of small-group instruction, but only if the teacher knows when and how to use this teaching practice. Grouws’ views underscore the importance of content knowledge and pedagogical skills. Other studies have also spoken to the importance of the skill level of the teacher. A study conducted in Northern Arizona showed the weakness of elementary education teachers taking Principles of Mathematic, a required course. 116 students were given a pretest focusing on basic math skills and only 6% passed 80% of the pretest (Goya, 2006).
Reading and Math Interventions

Schools are continuously searching for a program or tool to address the instructional needs of low performing students. Schools will purchase a multitude of programs with the hope that they will resolve the issue (Schmoker, 1999). As schools tried to improve the academic performance of their students, too often too much time is spent on searching for the “silver bullet”, trying to find that magical thing that can “cure” the academic woes. As a result, schools and districts adopt too many programs, sometimes in conflict with each other. If some level of success is met, districts and schools are not able to tease out which programs contributed to their success. In addition, they are not able to “scale up” to benefit other schools or the district as a whole.

Research has shown that scripted programs have a greater impact on student outcomes than non-scripted programs. In 2003, the University of Pennsylvania conducted a study on America’s Choice, one of many comprehensive school reform models. The study focused on an urban New Jersey district with a largely African American, low income student population in grades 4-6. The study revealed that even after statistically controlling for the background characteristics of teachers and students and students’ prior test performance, implementation of America’s Choice was associated with significantly high learning gains for students (Supovitz and May, 2003) Another study conducted in Baltimore, Maryland in 2003 by Johns Hopkins University found that another comprehensive school reform model, Direct Instruction, helped students make dramatic test score gains in reading and math. Students in 1st and 3rd grade scores rose from 16th to the 48th percentile in math and from 17th to the 49th percentile in reading (Mac Iver,
Kemper and Stringfield, 2003). A 2009 Consortium for Policy Research study (Rowan, Correnti, Miller, and Camburn, 2009) gathered data from 115 high-poverty elementary schools located in 45 school districts in 17 states across the country utilizing three of the most widely used scripted programs (Success for All, Accelerated School Project, and America’s Choice). Like earlier studies, they found that academic gains were greatest when teachers adhered closely to the prescribed teaching practices and implemented all aspects of the program as prescribed. Additional studies supported the findings of these studies (May and Supovitz, 2006; Park and Datnow, 2008; and Reeves, 2010).

Scripted programs produce successful outcomes regarding student achievement, but what exactly makes them different from other instructional programs? Scripted programs provide classroom teachers and school administrators with a clear framework for implementation, assessment and monitoring student progress. The framework outlines explicitly what the teacher is expected to teach and how. It clearly defines what it looks like when the student is learning. Monitoring checkpoints and the expected rate of success are identified to measure student growth and achievement. The framework also informs the teacher when a student should move to the next level or exit the program altogether. One of the drawbacks of scripted programs is teachers are not always in favor of scripted programs because there is a feeling that it prohibits creativity and minimizes their expertise.
Staffing urban schools can be a challenging task. In the teacher profession working in an urban school is viewed by some as a rite of passage; teachers cut their teeth, hone their craft and look for greener pastures. As a result, positions within these schools are often not filled by the most experienced and seasoned teachers. In addition, the rate of turnover of new teachers continues to increase. Overall, within the past 16 years it has increased by 40 percent; with high need schools being impacted the most (Carroll, Fulton and Doerr, 2010). According to The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future nearly one-fourth of new teachers leave the profession within the first three years; in urban areas the number is even greater with almost half leaving within the first five years (NCTAF, as cited in Curran and Goldrick, 2002).

Urban and high need schools are staffed with inexperienced teachers. The strength of the teacher lies in their understanding and mastery of their content and their ability to deliver it (Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, 1995). Teacher expertise is critical to student achievement. If teachers are not strong in their content and pedagogical practice the academic performance of students will be adversely impacted. The quality of the teacher is one of the most powerful influences on student achievement (Wei, Darling-Hammond and Adamson, 2010). Therefore, the support and development of the teacher is essential.

Professional development is an integral part of the educational process. It is the forum used to provide the continued support and guidance to educators. Districts and
schools are responsible for providing the opportunities of continued guidance and support to their staff. Researchers have spent extensive time trying to determine the difference between high performing and underperforming schools. One of the common denominators is the professional learning opportunities within the respective schools. Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Development in the United States and Abroad identified several key findings regarding professional development (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson and Orphanos, 2009). One finding was that effective professional development is intensive, ongoing, and connected to practice; focuses on the teaching and learning of specific academic content, is connected to other school initiatives and builds strong working relationships among teachers.

Professional development that is intensive, ongoing and connected to practice provides the focus, relevancy and the alignment essential to academic success. Schools should schedule consistent time for staff learning, engage staff in learning activities that are a direct reflection of their school improvement plan, and identify rigorous learning objectives and expected outcomes (Wei, et al, 2010).

Professional development connected to other school initiatives provides the necessary link for students and staff. Actions within the school environment are not occurring in isolation; they have purpose and meaning. All actions occur with the same and goal and objectives in mind (Wei, et al 2010).
Professional development that builds strong working relationships among teachers is critical to maximizing the learning of teachers and positively influencing student achievement. When teachers are engaging in collaborative inquiry it has a positive impact on student achievement (Love, 2009).

The findings presented by Darling-Hammond and her colleagues (2009) underscore the need for a professional development environment that provides the opportunity for teachers to practice and engage in learning with and from their colleagues. Schools must provide this in the most efficient and effective manner.

Practice-oriented staff development carried out at the school building level was identified as a characteristic of unusually effective schools (i.e., schools that have much higher achievement than most other schools enrolling similar groups of students) in a comprehensive review of effective schools research published in 1990 (Levine and Lezotte, 1990). Job embedded professional development provides teachers the opportunity for site based practice. Job embedded professional development refers to teacher learning that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teacher’s content-specific instructional practice with the intent of improving student learning (Darling-Hammond et.al., 1995; Hirsh and Killion, 2009). Job embedded professional development creates an opportunity of learning and growth for individual teachers as well as the whole staff through the informal and formal conversations and specific acts of teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009). The National Staff Development Council identified various forms of job
embedded professional development, but viewed coaching as one of the most effective forms.

The increasing use of instructional coaches by districts reflects the growing consensus about what is high-quality job embedded professional development for teachers (Habegger and Hodanbosi, 2011). Researchers have identified many benefits of using instructional coaches as a form of job embedded professional development. Instructional coaches assist in the development of shared language and common understandings among teachers. They confirm that teachers practice new strategies more frequently and have a greater probability of understanding, utilizing and retaining the new skills and strategies in which they had been coached (L’Allier, Elish-Piper and Bean, 2010).

Instructional coaches are viewed as the “experts” when it comes to content knowledge and pedagogy. However, research also demonstrates instructional coaches need to be more than experts in their content area. Instructional coaches also need to be able to develop and cultivate the other skills that make high quality teachers. There are many skills that make a high quality teacher, but some of the key skills are facilitation, the ability to work with adult learners, and knowledge of the change process (Cogshall, Behrstock-Sherratt and Drill, 2011). If an instructional coach is going to effectively develop and support a teacher the instructional coach also needs to be developed and supported as well.
A study conducted in an urban school district in Texas focused on a project that implements a structured coaching program called Content Focused Coaching (CFC) (Matsumura, Garnier, Junker, Resnick and Bickel, 2009). CFC focuses on the training model for coaches that will provide support to the teachers. The intent of CFC is to provide the coaches with the necessary knowledge and skills needed to effectively support teachers and also assist in creating and developing the organizational conditions in schools and districts that are essential for effective coaching. The results of the study showed instructional coaches who participated in CFC had a more of an impact on the teachers within the buildings they supported. Teachers significantly and positively participated more frequently in coaching focused on enacting instruction and understanding the theory underlying effective reading comprehension instruction. Also, teachers in the CFC schools showed modest improvement in the quality of their observed and self-reported reading comprehension instruction.

Professional development that provides an opportunity for sustained job embedded professional development is the most effective. It is also important to develop and align the training based on the programs and practices being implemented. Additionally, on-site coaching increases the probability of implementing the program with fidelity, improves instructional practice and positively impacts student achievement. Lastly, instructional coaches also need to participate in training to better prepare them to deliver the supports and services to the teachers they are servicing.
Monitoring

When reviewing the literature there were no studies that spoke directly to monitoring. However, during my review of the literature in the areas discussed earlier in this paper it was an integral part of the programs and practices identified to be effective. When Simmons (2011) identified lessons learned from the eight schools in Chicago he described the need for check points to measure and make midcourse corrections and a cycle of monitoring and support. Ball et al. (2009) also discussed the pivotal role of monitoring as it relates to the effectiveness of scripted intervention programs. To be successful in their efforts to improve teaching and learning and student achievement, districts and schools must have a cycle of continuous monitoring and support.

The cycle of continuous monitoring and support affords schools and administrators the ability to know what is working and what is not. Martinez-Miller and Cervone (2007) discussed the importance having a process and a tool that creates a cycle of continuous improvement, focusing on the effects of instruction.

The framework of the process is based on the programmatic goals, objectives and outcomes in the areas of implementation and effectiveness. It clearly defines what is being monitored, how it will be monitored, the frequency and by whom. It also informs staff and students how information will be communicated. Lastly, it provides an opportunity for reflection and midcourse corrections.

The tool speaks to how the information will be collected and shared. The make-up of the tool should reflect the program expectations and desired outcomes. It is also
important to clearly define all terms and concepts to establish “common language” to minimize the lack of understanding. Lastly, the recording and reporting of information should be as simple and succinct as possible. The purpose of the tool is to present the findings not be the topic of conversation.

The opportunity to view, collect evidence, discuss and reflect on instructional practice creates an opportunity for positive change. However, this is a difficult environment to create and task to accomplish if the school based staff are not clear on the expectations of the instructional program. Schools need to have a clear point of contact and transparency should be the approach when it comes to monitoring and expectations (Corcoran, et.al, 2001).

An effective monitoring model is based upon what the program should look like when it’s working. It is also important to clearly define the parameters to assure the program is being measured appropriately. The tool used to collect the information should be aligned to the program expectations and desired outcomes. Lastly, monitoring models are most effective when the participants all share the same meaning and understanding of the concepts and terms.
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Appendix C

LOGIC MODELS: STATEMENT OF RATIONALE

My EPP focuses on the development of a support model for high need schools. Logic maps were included as an artifact to provide a graphic representation of the relationship among the forces that will shape the high need model. The logic maps will also serve as a blueprint and implementation guide of the model and support the development of additional artifacts.

In 2008 the Empowerment Model was created to support high need schools within the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). The Empowerment Model provided support, resources and services in the areas of instruction, leadership, student and family support and operations. The intent and purpose of the resources and services was to provide structured support and guidance to implement best practices that have a positive impact on teaching and learning.

This was accomplished by modeling and training the leadership and staff within the schools, ultimately preparing the school staff and leadership for autonomy, independence and academic success.
Defining the Model

Based on the best practices identified through research there were several changes made to the core and supplemental instructional materials that were going to be used within Empowerment Schools. The SDP purchased Imagine It! as the reading curricula and Prentice Hall as the mathematics curricula to be used within Empowerment Schools. Imagine It! was chosen based on the research related to improving students reading abilities. The design of the Imagine reading curricula appropriately addressed all of the key indicators outlined in the NRP study. It provided explicit and systematic instruction in the areas of phonemic awareness and phonics. It also provided explicit instruction in the six text comprehension strategies. It also provided an abundance of resources and materials to support the teacher in their planning and delivery of instruction.

The existing mathematics program for grades K-5, Everyday Mathematics, remained in place, but a change was made to the middle grades mathematics program. Prentice Hall was chosen as the mathematics curricula based on the research related to improving students’ mathematics abilities. The Prentice Hall mathematics curricula appropriately addressed all of the key elements identified within the research. It provided a balance of skill- based instruction and problem solving as well as a focus on procedural fluency and conceptual understanding. Prentice Hall also placed a heavy emphasis on supporting teachers. There were extensive professional development resources available to teachers on-line to support their development and understanding of mathematics content. There were also an array of supports and resources to aid teachers in their planning and delivery of their daily lesson. To implement the reading and mathematics
curricula, the specific components of the program to address the academic needs of the student population were identified and purchased. A professional development plan for teachers, instructional coaches and administrators was also developed. The curriculum logic map explicitly outlines the steps taken to implement the reading and mathematics curricula used within Empowerment Model schools.

Based on the historical performance of the Empowerment Model schools, it was important to assure that there was time allocated to accelerate the learning of students. Therefore, all Empowerment Model schools implemented a daily 45 minute intervention period for reading and mathematics. The intervention period focused on providing an opportunity of learning and acceleration. This opportunity of learning and acceleration was viewed as a continuum so it was important to make sure there were materials to address deficiencies and capitalize on strengths. SRA Direct Instruction was purchased by the district to address deficiencies of student learning and Junior Great Books was purchased as a resource to be used with students who did not need the intervention. The purchase was made based on the research related to reading and mathematics interventions. To implement the programs, the appropriate components were identified and purchased that addressed the academic needs and strengths of the student population. A professional development plan for teachers, instructional coaches and administrators was also developed. The intervention logic map explicitly outlines the steps taken to implement the reading and mathematics interventions used within Empowerment Schools.
The Philadelphia Do Now! was developed and distributed to all Empowerment Schools. This tool replaced all test preparation resources previously used by the schools. The Philadelphia Do Now! addressed the reading and mathematics deficiencies identified in the high needs schools PSSA data. All school completed one lesson in reading and mathematics each day. The schools also used the data form the daily lesson and the practice tests to measure improvement and identify instructional areas in need of continued support. There were also changes made to the afterschool and summer programs used within Empowerment Schools.

Historically SDP always provided extended learning and summer programs. However, the length of the program and the resources used within the program was driven at the school level. The extended learning program within Empowerment Model schools was revised to assure the purpose, focus and materials was aligned to what was happening during the day. The summer school program was redesigned. The name was changed to SLAM, which stood for Summer Learning and More. SLAM was a full day summer program and it addressed academics as well as provided opportunities for students to be involved in extracurricular activities. Table 1 below outlines the instructional model and highlights the changes to core and supplemental instructional resources provided to Empowerment Schools.
Table 10: Empowerment Schools K-8 Instructional Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Core Curriculum</th>
<th>Targeted Intervention</th>
<th>Extended Learning and Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glencoe (7-8)-new</td>
<td>SRA Direct instruction -new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Language for Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reading Mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Corrective Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prentice Hall (6-8)-new</td>
<td>• Connecting Math Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Corrective Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the core and supplemental curriculum changes, personnel changes were made to align with how Empowerment Model schools would be monitored and supported.

Every Empowerment School was staffed with at least one School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS). The role of the SBIS was to support the implementation of the Empowerment Instructional Model and provide direct support to the teaching staff.

**Cost of Instructional Component**

To implement the instructional component of the Empowerment Model, there were both one time and recurring costs. New curriculum materials were funded by the district’s operation budget during the initial year of implementation. The school was
responsible for any consumables and replenishing of materials in subsequent years. One of the advantages of being a large district is the buying power it provides. Publishing companies typically provide complimentary professional development for their programs, which usually consists of one to two professional developments providing an overview of the materials. However, I was able to negotiate ongoing support for the Empowerment Model schools and their staff at no additional cost. This support came in the form of full-time staff on site from the publishing companies, weekly professional development for SBISs and Office of Empowerment Models school staff and monthly on site coaching for SBISs and teachers.

In addition to materials and professional development, there were also costs associated with personnel and infrastructure changes. The SBIS was a new position created as a part of the model. The SBIS is a school based coach who was responsible for assisting with the implementation and monitoring of the Empowerment Model and providing daily in class coaching and support to the teaching staff. The SBIS functioned as an onsite resource and guide that supported the implementation of the intervention and curriculum materials within the classroom. The cost of the new position was covered by increasing the position allocation of Empowerment Model schools. The Office of Empowerment Schools Support (OESS) was created to design, implement, support and monitor the model. OESS consisted of one Deputy Chief, one Director, five support positions and six School Improvement Specialists (SIS). The SISs are central office coaches who were responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the Empowerment Model and coaching the SBISs. The SIS was an integral part of the
Empowerment Model because they served as a liaison between the school and central office. Also, the SIS provided immediate monitoring and feedback from schools essential to effective implementation of the Empowerment model. Table 2 outlines the one time and recurring costs of the instructional component of the Empowerment Model.

Table 11: Cost of Instructional Components of Empowerment Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Materials</th>
<th>Initial Cost</th>
<th>Recurring Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine It!</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>15,000 average per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glencoe Literature</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>7,000 average per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>5,000 average per school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Materials</th>
<th>Initial Cost</th>
<th>Recurring Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA Direct Instruction (Reading and Mathematics)</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>25,000 average per school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extended Learning and Support</th>
<th>Initial Cost</th>
<th>Recurring Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Day</td>
<td>35,000 annually per school</td>
<td>35,000 annually per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Great Books</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>5,000 average per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Do Now!</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>5,000 average per school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summer Learning and More                     | 1,000,000 per school | 1,000,000 per school |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.L.A.M. (20 Schools)</th>
<th>Initial Cost</th>
<th>Recurring Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJIS (71)</td>
<td>70,000 average annual salary per position</td>
<td>70,000 average annual salary per position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OESS Deputy Chief (1)</td>
<td>125,000 average annual salary</td>
<td>125,000 average annual salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OESS Director (1)</td>
<td>110,000 average annual salary</td>
<td>110,000 average annual salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OESS School Improvement Specialist (6)</td>
<td>75,000 average annual salary</td>
<td>75,000 average annual salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OESS Support personnel (5)</td>
<td>45,000 average annual salary per position</td>
<td>45,000 average annual salary per position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementing the Model**

I created an intervention (Appendix A) and curriculum (Appendix B) logic map to provide a visual representation of the overall approach associated with the
implementation of the core and intervention instructional materials. Each logic map consists of three components input, process and outcome. The input identifies the needs and resources essential to accomplishing the work. The process identifies the steps and actions that will be taken to meet the overall outcomes. The outcome identifies what will be the result at the end.

Input

There are fourteen inputs on the intervention logic map and fifteen inputs on the curriculum logic map. The inputs fell into three categories professional development, personnel and product and services. Three of the key inputs for both logic models are the School Improvement Specialist (SIS), the School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS) and the national consultants.

The national consultants are individuals employed by the publishing company that developed the intervention and curriculum materials in the areas of reading and mathematics being used in Empowerment Schools. The national consultants from the company will assist in the development and implementation of a professional development plan. Working collaboratively with the national consultants assures the appropriate materials have been purchased and the design of the professional development is tailored to meet the needs and messaging of the district.

Process

In both logic models the first key activity was to assess the data to determine the need of the students. I analyzed the PSSA results to determine the strengths and
weaknesses of the students within Empowerment Model schools. Based on my analysis I identified publishing companies that have potential products, supports and services that could help improve student performance within Empowerment Model schools.

The second key activity was to choose the core and intervention instructional materials. Choosing the materials included several steps and the overall process took about three months. The first step was to meet with all publishing companies and review the data and discuss potential products that could address the needs identified by the data. My next step was to set up a symposium where teachers and administrators could receive a brief overview and interact with the materials. Allowing teachers and administrators to preview products from multiple providers and have publishing companies provide data showing how districts and schools with similar demographics improved when they used the product helped the decision making process more inclusive and increase buy in. Once the materials were identified the core materials and intervention were purchased. The next key activity was to develop the professional development plan.

The professional development plan addressed the particular training needs of all positions and staff that will interact with the materials. The planning, development and implementation of the plan took approximately one month. During this time weekly planning meetings were held with the publishing company and OESS staff. I provided an outline identifying the overall framework and desired goals as well as the role and responsibilities of all parties. With an implementation of this magnitude, I thought it was important to have staff on the ground that could assist the consultants with the training.
Therefore, there was a great emphasis on the initial and ongoing training of the SISs and the SBISs. Their training occurred prior to the teacher training and focused on the components of the program, how to implement with fidelity and how to support and monitor the programs. The administrator training provided an overview of the program and how to monitor the program for effectiveness. The teacher training was held regionally and provided an overview, how to implement with fidelity and administer and score the placement tests. Understanding how to administer and score the placement test was critical because it informed schools of how much of each level of the intervention materials were needed, what groups needed to be formed and the number of personnel necessary to support the groups. Once teachers participated in the training, administered and scored the placement tests the groups were formed and materials were ordered.

The initial focus at the school level was implementing with fidelity. SBISs continued to provide turnaround training to teachers for both the core and intervention programs. The training being provided was based on the professional development they received weekly. The focus of the SBISs was the “look for(s)” of the programs; what does it look like when it is implemented well. It was also important to focus on the logistics; group settings, class size, materials and schedule. Principals utilized the monitoring tools received during their training to support the initial implementation, informing the SBIS of teachers who need support.
Outcome

The outcome components of the intervention and curriculum logic maps have several outcomes in common. The outcomes focus on the improvement of instructional practice and student achievement.

The first is the identification, alignment and systemic implementation of instructional materials that meet the needs of the identified student population. Appropriately identifying the need, choosing products that address the need and implementing with fidelity improve the probability of effectiveness greatly.

The second is decreasing the skill deficit of students within the schools by improving the pedagogical practices of the teachers responsible for their learning. Identifying pedagogical practices that specifically address the deficient skills of the students and training teachers to implement them with fidelity improves the chance to eliminate the deficiency because the focus and support is specific and targeted.

The third is the improvement of student’s daily instructional practices and performance. Providing the appropriate learning structure on a daily basis will help students perform better regularly.

The fourth is the overall positive impact on student achievement. Using effective teaching practices and materials with fidelity that have been specifically identified for their student population should result in improved student achievement.
The curriculum logic map had an additional outcome, which was to increase the amount of explicit teaching. To improve student performance we must expose them to more demonstration, explanation and modeling of instructional concepts.

The overall purpose and expectation of the intervention and curriculum logic map was to create a visual presentation of the steps and possible variables that may occur during the implementation of the intervention and core curriculum materials that will be used in the Empowerment Schools.
Appendix C.A

Intervention

[Diagram of the intervention process and outcomes]
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Curriculum
Appendix D

EMPOWERMENT LEARNING PATHWAYS

The Empowerment Learning Pathways is the Reading and Mathematics intervention guide. The Learning Pathways identified all of the Reading and Mathematics interventions used within Empowerment Schools. The guide informed teachers what the appropriate interventions are for each grade and content area. It also informed teachers how to observe students to determine who should be assessed, how to assess the student and identify the appropriate starting point. Lastly, it informed teachers where the intervention supports began at each grade, how to appropriately exit students from the intervention and provide accelerated learning opportunities for students.

The Empowerment Learning Pathways was a customized tool developed based on the intervention and enrichment instructional tools used within Empowerment Schools. The goal of the pathways was to provide a teacher-friendly tool that appropriately and effectively informed and guided the decision making process of teachers when determining instructional supports for students. As a part of my responsibilities in the Office of Empowerment Schools Support (OESS) I led the effort to develop the tool with the support McGraw Hill. As the architect of the learning pathways, I created the overall
design and framework of the product. McGraw Hill assisted in the development, providing technical assistance related to the appropriate identification of interventions and exiting students from interventions.

To develop the overall design of the pathways I organized a work group, which consisted of the School Improvement Specialists (SIS) and representatives from McGraw Hill. The initial work session I provided them with an initial outline of the overall project. The outline identified the purpose, desired use, targeted audience and projected tasks to complete the project. One of my main objectives during the work sessions was to clearly define the entry and exit point for every reading and mathematics intervention being utilized within Empowerment Schools. I thought it was important to provide the information in a sequential format and by grade. Listing the information with a sense of order and utilizing a “if and then” structure made the information and next steps easier to understand and follow through. The last component of the overall design was the how the document would look. I led a discussion about what would be aesthetically pleasing and be able to provide the necessary and essential information in a succinct format. As a result of the conversion it was determined that displaying the information in a colorful format and bulleting the information would be the most advantageous.

Developing the framework focused on the alignment of the interventions and the entry, exiting and acceleration of students. Since we were using several supplemental instructional programs to support, enhance and or accelerate learning I thought it was important that we showed how they all work together. This required entry and exit points
to be clear. To accomplish this I led a discussion with the publishing companies of the various products reviewing the predetermined entry and exit points. The goal was to enhance my understanding so I can align all products being used. After meeting with all companies I was able to make adjustments to some of the original entry and exit points to establish alignment with all products, which would allow teachers to better understand when and how they should use one of the tools. This also assisted us in assuring that students would not become stuck in an intervention because it was clear what progress looks like, when a student should move and how we can accelerate learning. After the design was completed the final step was to mass produce the product and develop a professional development session that would provide training to the School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS) that would allow them to provide turn around training to their staff within the respective building.

McGraw Hill agreed to mass produce and package the product. I also met with their national consultants to develop the training that would be provided to the SBISs. The training was delivered. The training focused on the purpose and the appropriate use of the tool.
GRADE K

- Students who are eligible (LEP, IEP, IEP/EP) for the Language for Learning program in September will begin that program early in September.
- All other students will be observed for possible placement in Language for Learning at a later point in the fall.
- Students who do not test into the Language for Learning Direct Instruction (DL) program will be placed in the Jr. Great Books program.
GRADE 1

- New students will take the Reading Mastery Level 1 placement test. If they fail this test, they will begin at Grade K, lesson 11. If possible, using the acceleration schedule found in the Curriculum Based Assessment Handbook for Grade K.
- Students who place in the Reading Mastery Level 1 program will complete that program.
- Students who began Reading Mastery in Kindergarten will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
- Students who do not test into a Jr. Intervention program will be screened for the Jr. Great Books program.
GRADE 2

- New students will take the Reading Mastery Level 2 placement test. Students who pass do not need intervention. Students who fail this test will then take the test for Level 1.
- New students who pass into Reading Mastery Level 1 will complete that program, if possible at the accelerated pace found in the Curriculum Based Assessment Handbook for Grade 1.
- New students who fail the test for Reading Mastery Grade 1 automatically place into Reading Mastery K and will begin that program at lesson 11. The teacher should use the accelerated pacing schedule found in the Curriculum Based Assessment Handbook for Grade K.
- Returning students who began Reading Mastery in Grade 1 will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
- Students who do not test into a DI intervention program will be placed in the Jr. Great Books program.
GRADE 3

- New students will take the Reading Mastery Level 3 placement test. Students who pass do not need intervention. Students who fail this test will then take the test for Level 2.
- New students who test into Reading Mastery Level 2 will complete that program.
- New students who fail the test for Reading Mastery Grade 2 will take the test for Reading Mastery Grade 1. Students who place into Reading Mastery Grade 1 will complete that program if possible, using the pacing schedule found in the Curriculum Based Assessment Handbook for Grade 1, and then move on to Reading Mastery Grade 2.
- New students who fail the test for Grade 1 automatically place into Reading Mastery Grade K and will begin that program at lesson 11. The teacher should use the accelerated pacing schedule found in the Curriculum Based Assessment Handbook for Grade K and continue to Grade 1, again at the accelerated pace, if possible.
- Retaining students who began Reading Mastery in Grade 2 will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
- Students completing Reading Mastery 2 should be tested for possible Corrective Reading placement in Grade 4.

All students who are receiving additional instructional intervention support are eligible to participate in the Extended Day Voyager Learning Program.
GRADE 4

- New students will take the Corrective Reading Decoding Placement Test.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding A will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B1.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B1 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B2.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B2 will complete that program and then enter the Core Program Intervention.
- Returning students who placed into Corrective Reading will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
- New students who place beyond Corrective Reading Decoding B2 will be screened for the Core Intervention program or Jr. Great Books program.

All students who are receiving additional instructional intervention support are eligible to participate in the Extended Day Voyager Learning Program.
GRADE 5

- New students will take the Corrective Reading Decoding Placement Test.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding A will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B1.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B1 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B2.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B2 will complete that program and then enter the Core Program Intervention.
- Returning students who placed into Corrective Reading will continue the progression suggested on the flowchart.
- New students who place beyond Corrective Reading B2 will be assessed for the Core Program Intervention or the Junior Great Books program.

All students who are receiving additional instructional intervention support are eligible to participate in the Extended Day Voyager Learning Program.
GRADE 6

- New students will take the Corrective Reading Decoding Placement Test.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding A will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B1.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B1 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B2.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B2 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding C.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading C will complete that program and then enter the Core Program Intervention.
- Returning students who placed into Corrective Reading will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
- New students who do not place into a DI intervention program will be screened for the Core Intervention program or the Roundtable program.

All students who are receiving additional instructional intervention support are eligible to participate in the Extended Day Voyage Learning Program.
GRADE 7

- New students will take the Corrective Reading Decoding Placement Test.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding A will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B1.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B1 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B2.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B2 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding C.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading C will complete that program.
- Students who have completed Corrective Reading Decoding C will move into Read to Achieve Content and complete that program.
- Returning students who placed into Corrective Reading will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
- New students who do not place into a DI intervention program will be screened for the Rountable program.

All students who are receiving additional instructional intervention support are eligible to participate in the Extended-Day Voyager Learning Program.
GRADE 8

- New students will take the Corrective Reading Decoding Placement Test.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding A will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B1.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B1 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B2.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B2 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding C.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading C will complete that program.
- Students who have completed Corrective Reading Decoding C will move into Read to Achieve Content and complete that program.
- Returning students who placed into Corrective Reading will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
- New students who do not place into a DI intervention program will be screened for the Roundtable program.

All students who are receiving additional instructional intervention support are eligible to participate in the Standard Day Wysegel Learning Program.
GRADE 9

- New students will take the Corrective Reading Decoding Placement Test.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding A will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B1.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B1 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B2.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B2 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding C.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading C will complete that program.
- Students who have completed Corrective Reading Decoding C will move into Read to Achieve Content and complete that program.
- Returning students who placed into Corrective Reading will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
GRADE 10

- New students will take the Corrective Reading Decoding Placement Test.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding A will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B1.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B1 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding B2.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading Decoding B2 will complete that program and then begin Corrective Reading Decoding C.
- Students who place into Corrective Reading C will complete that program.
- Returning students who placed into Corrective Reading will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.

All students who are receiving additional instructional intervention support are eligible to participate in the Standard Day Wylie Learning Program.
K-4 Mathematics Intervention Pathways

K
- All students will be placed in intervention using a validated Diagnostic Math Battery.

GRADE 1
- Connecting Math: Level 1, Lessons 1-10
- Connecting Math: Level 2, Lessons 1-10
- End of Intervention Sequence

GRADE 2
- Connecting Math: Level 2, Lessons 1-10
- Connecting Math: Level 3, Lessons 1-10
- End of Intervention Sequence

GRADE 3
- Corrective Math: Addition
- End of Intervention Sequence

GRADE 4
- Corrective Math: Addition
- Corrective Math: Subtraction
- End of Intervention Sequence

DISTAR Arithmetic I

Should be at the start of the intervention sequence for self-contained special education classrooms.

AS and LSS who:
- cannot count to 10
- do not recognize numerals
- do not have one-to-one correspondence when counting objects

AS = Autistic Support
LSS = Life Skills Student
Kindergarten

- All students will be tested in November using a modified Everyday Math Mid-Year Assessment to identify those who need the Direct Instruction math intervention, Connecting Math Concepts.

- Students requiring mathematics interventions will be placed in Connecting Math Concepts (OMO) Level A. Students will complete that level through Lesson 60 then exit the intervention program.

- K.5 Students not requiring math interventions will complete part 3 of the Everyday Math lesson as documented in the Modified Planning and Scheduling Timeline.
Grade 1

• Students who began Connecting Math Concepts in Kindergarten will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
• New students will take the Connecting Math Concepts Level B placement test. Students who pass with 8 or fewer errors do not need intervention at this time. Students who fail the test with 9 or more errors will begin Connecting Math Concepts Level A at Lesson 11.
• Students in Connecting Math Concepts Level A will complete that level through Lesson 120 and then exit the intervention program.
• K–5 students not requiring math interventions will complete part 3 of the Everyday Math lesson as documented in the Modified Planning and Scheduling Timeline.
Grade 2

- Students who began Connecting Math Concepts in Grade 1 will continue the progression suggested on the flow chart.
- New students will take the Connecting Math Concepts Level B placement test. Students who pass the test—making no more than 4 errors—do not need intervention at this time. Students who fail the test, making 5–9 errors, will begin Connecting Math Concepts Level B at Lesson 11. Students who fail the test, making 10 or more errors, place into Connecting Math Concepts, Level A, Lesson 11.
- Students in Connecting Math Concepts Level A will complete through Lesson 120 and then exit the intervention program.
- K-5 students not requiring math interventions will complete part 3 of the Everyday Math lesson as documented in the Modified Planning and Scheduling Timeline.
Grade 3

- New students will take the Corrective Math (CM) placement test.
- Students who place into the CM-Addition module will complete that module then exit the intervention program.
- Students who place above the CM-Addition module do not require intervention at this time.
- K - 3 students not requiring math interventions will complete part 3 of the Everyday Math lesson as documented in the Modified Planning and Scheduling Timeline.
Grade 4

- New students will take the Corrective Math (CM) placement test.
- Students who place into the CM Addition module will complete that module and the CM Subtraction module. After completing both modules the student will exit the intervention program.
- Students who place into the CM Subtraction module will complete that module then exit the intervention program.
- Students who place above the CM Subtraction module do not require intervention at this time.
- K – 5 students not requiring math interventions will complete part 3 of the Everyday Math lesson as documented in the Modified Planning and Scheduling Timeline.
Grade 5

- New students will take the Corrective Math (CM) placement test.
- Students who place into the CM Addition module will complete that module and the CM Subtraction module.
- Students who place into the CM Subtraction module will complete that module and the CM Multiplication module. After completing both modules the student will exit the intervention program.
- Students who place into the CM multiplication module will complete that module then exit the intervention program.
- Students who place above the CM multiplication module do not require intervention at this time.
- K – 5 students not requiring math interventions will complete part 3 of the Everyday Math lesson as documented in the Modified Planning and Scheduling Timeline.
Grade 6

- New students will take the Corrective Math (CM) placement test.
- Students who place into the CM Addition module will complete that module and the CM Subtraction module.
- Students who place into the CM Subtraction module will complete that module and the CM Multiplication module.
- Students who place into the CM Multiplication module will complete that module and the Division module.
- Students who place into the CM Division module will complete that module and the Basic Fractions module.
- Students who place into Basic Fractions will complete that module and no longer require intervention at this time.
- Students who place above the CM Basic Fractions module do not receive the intervention program.
- Grade 6-8 students not requiring math interventions will complete the Math in Context Enrichment Problems found in the Independence Practice portion of the Modified Planning and Scheduling Timeline.
Grades 7–10

- New students will take the Corrective Math (CM) placement test.
- Students who place into the CM Addition module will complete that module and the CM Subtraction module.
- Students who place into the CM Subtraction module will complete that module and the CM Multiplication module.
- Students who place into the CM Multiplication module will complete that module and the CM Division module.
- Students who place into the CM Division module will complete that module and the GM Basic Fractions module.
- Students who place into the GM Basic Fractions module will complete that module and the CM Fractions, Decimals, and Percents module.
- Students who place into the GM Fractions, Decimals and Percents module will complete that module and the intervention program.
- Students that place above the CM Fractions, Decimals and Percents do not require the intervention program.

Grade 7-8 students not requiring math interventions will complete the main in Context Enrichment Problems found in the Independent Practice portion of the Modified Planning and Scheduling Timeline.
Appendix E

PHILADELPHIA DO NOW!

Overview

The Philadelphia Do Now! is a skill development and test taking strategy program that was developed in conjunction with the Office of Empowerment Schools Support (OESS) and Voyager Learning. OESS was the architect of the test taking strategy program, creating the overall design of the product, identifying the instructional focus and developing the instructional framework. Voyager Learning assisted in the development of items to address the instructional areas of focus and was responsible for the mass production and packaging of the product. The customized tool was developed based on the instructional deficiencies exhibited by students in Empowerment schools on the Pennsylvania Standardized State Assessment (PSSA). The goal of the program was to provide a teacher-friendly format tool that optimized instructional time and reinforced key assessment anchors taught during core instruction.

The purpose of the Philadelphia Do Now! was to provide students in Empowerment Schools with the opportunity to be retaught and practice the skills where there was a demonstrated deficiency on the PSSA. Students received explicit instruction on the identified skills and learned critical strategies needed to build and improve their
reading and math foundation. Key test-taking strategies were modeled, taught and practiced by students to internalize and apply when taking the PSSA. Students also learned and practiced constructed response items for reading and open-ended response items for math.

**Development**

OESS provided targeted support to the 95 underperforming schools within the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). In 2009 only 35.7% of students within Empowerment Schools were proficient in Reading and 39.5% in Mathematics on the PSSA. Historically schools purchased test preparation materials in hopes to improve student performance on the PSSA. The materials purchased were mirrored after the framework and problems students are likely to encounter on the PSSA. However, the materials purchased did not strategically and specifically target the school’s academic needs based on their student achievement data. Nor did it provide teachers with support and guidance about how they should reteach the deficient skill. The Office of Empowerment Schools wanted to provide the schools with a more strategically aligned test taking resource that not only mirrored the items on the PSSA, but also provided support and guidance in the areas of re-teaching, modeling and practice for the teacher.

**Design Process**

The Philadelphia Do Now! design process consisted of three steps: data analysis, lesson development and formatting, and the development of a scope and sequence. The PSSA is
administered annually and assesses student’s proficiency on the Pennsylvania standards at their grade level in reading and mathematics. The first step I took was to pull the PSSA data from the 95 Empowerment Schools and prepare the information for analysis so I could identify the areas for improvement in reading and mathematics. The test is constructed from eligible content, which is grade specific. Eligible content is the core of the standard and anchors. It represents what the state has identified as potential competencies for students that can be measured at each grade level. Therefore, I organized the information by the reporting categories for Reading and Mathematics. The Reading component of the PSSA has two reporting categories. The reporting categories are:

A. Comprehension and Reading Skills
   A.1 Understand fiction appropriate to grade level
   A.2 Understanding nonfiction appropriate to grade level

B. Interpretation and Analysis of fictional and nonfictional text
   B.1 Understand components within and between texts
   B.2 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text

The Mathematics component of the PSSA has 5 reporting categories. The reporting categories are:

A. Numbers and Operations
B. Measurement
C. Geometry

D. Algebraic Concepts

E. Data Analysis and Probability

Within the reporting categories for each content area I organized the information to show the percent correct for each reporting category and its components. I then reviewed how many questions were in each category because I wanted to be sure prior to identifying a potential area of improvement there were enough questions to merit it being identified as a weakness. Once I categorized my results in ascending order, I then reviewed the standards and eligible content associated with the area(s) where the school demonstrated a need for improvement.

The data analysis of the PSSA for the 95 Empowerment Schools netted deficiencies in every reporting category for reading as well as mathematics. To narrow the focus and identify what skills should be targeted, I reviewed the test blueprint for the PSSA. The test blueprint provided by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania identifies the possible percentage of questions in each reporting category by subject, grade and genre. Listed below are three tables that outline the percentage items that may be assessed on the PSSA by grade, reporting category and genre: Table 1 outlines the reading reporting clusters, Table 2 outlines the genre coverage and Table 3 outlines the test blueprint for mathematics.
Table 12
PSSA Reading Reporting Clusters Test Blueprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Comprehension and Reading Skills (Category A)</th>
<th>Literature and Interpretation (category B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>20-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>20-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>20-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>30-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>30-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
PSSA Reading Passage Test Blueprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Fiction and Nonfiction Narrative</th>
<th>Nonfiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>30-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>30-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>30-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
PSSA Mathematics Test Blueprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reporting Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers and Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>43-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18-22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After taking into account the test blueprints the results of my analysis of the PSSA reading data showed there were three areas that students were consistently weak in across grades 3 through 8. Listed below are the skills I identified as key areas of focus within the two reading reporting categories for grades 3 through 8:

- Anchor A.1 Understand fiction appropriate to grade level
  - A.1.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions based on text
  - A.1.6 Identify genre of text
  - A.2 Understand nonfiction appropriate to grade level.
    - A.2.6 Identify genre of text

- Anchor B.1: Understand components within and between texts
  - B.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, and describe components of fiction and literary nonfiction
  - B.1.2 Make connections between texts

- Anchor B.3 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text
  - B.3.1 Differentiate fact from opinion in nonfictional text
  - B.3.2 Distinguish between essential and nonessential information within text
Appendix A outlines all the skills I identified as a result of the PSSA reading data analysis.

The results of my mathematics data analysis did not yield deficiencies that were consistent across all grades. There were some consistencies across a couple of grades, numbers and operations, but the PSSA test blueprint demonstrated the need to focus on other reporting categories based upon grade. Therefore, I identified the following skills in mathematics as key areas of focus within the five reporting categories for grades 3 through 8:

Grade 3
Numbers and Operations
- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems
  - Anchor M3.A.1.1: Apply place-value concepts and numeration to counting, ordering, grouping and equivalency
  - Anchor M3.A.1.3 Count, compare and make change using a collection of coins and one dollar bills
- Compute accurately and fluently and make reasonable estimates.
  - Anchor M3.A.3.1 Solve problems using addition, subtraction and multiplication (straight computation and word problems).
  - Anchor M3.A.3.2 Use estimation skills to arrive at conclusions
Grade 4

Numbers and Operations

- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems.
  - Anchor M4.A.1.1 Use models and/or words to represent quantities as decimals, fractions or mixed numbers.
  - Anchor M4.A.1.2 Compare quantities and magnitudes of numbers.
  - Anchor M4.A.1.3 Develop and/or apply number theory concepts to represent numbers in various ways

- Understand the meaning of operations, use operations and understand how they relate to each other.
  - Anchor M4.A.2.1 Use operations to solve problems (may include word problems).

- Compute accurately and fluently and make reasonable estimates.
  - Anchor M4.A.3.1 Apply rounding and/or estimation strategies to solve problems.

Grade 5

Numbers and Operations

- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems.
  - Anchor M5.A.1.1 Express numbers in equivalent forms.
  - Anchor M5.A.1.2 Demonstrate understanding of place value of whole numbers and decimals.
  - Anchor M5.A.1.3 Compare quantities or magnitudes of numbers.
  - Anchor M5.A.1.4 Use simple applications of negative numbers (number line, counting, temperature)
Anchor M5.A.1.5 Use or develop models to represent fractions and/or mixed numbers.

Anchor M5.A.1.6 Apply number theory concepts (i.e., primes, factors, multiples, composites).

- Understand the meaning of operations, use operations and understand how they relate to each other.
  - Anchor M5.A.2.1 Solve problems involving decimals, fractions and/or whole numbers (straight computation or word problems).

- Compute accurately and fluently and make reasonable estimates.
  - Anchor M5.A.3.1 Apply estimation strategies to a variety of problems

**Grade 6**

**Numbers and Operations**

- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems.
  - Anchor M6.A.1.1 Express numbers in equivalent forms
  - Anchor M6.A.1.2 Compare quantities and/or magnitudes of numbers.
  - Anchor M6.A.1.3 Apply number theory concepts (i.e., factors, multiples).
  - Anchor M6.A.1.4 Use or develop models to represent percents.

**Algebraic Concepts**

- Represent and/or analyze mathematical situations using numbers, symbols, words, tables, and/or graphs.
  - Anchor M6.D.2.1 Select and/or use appropriate strategies to solve number sentences.
  - Anchor M6.D.2.2 Create and/or interpret expressions or equations that model problem situations.
Grade 7

Numbers and Operations

- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems.
  - Anchor M7.A.1.1 Express numbers in equivalent forms.
- Compute accurately and fluently and make reasonable estimates.
  - Anchor M7.A.3.1 Apply estimation strategies to a variety of problems.
  - Anchor M7.A.3.2 Compute accurately with and without use of a calculator.

Algebraic Concepts

- Represent and/or analyze mathematical situations using numbers, symbols, words, tables, and/or graphs.
  - Anchor M7.D.2.1 Select and/or use appropriate strategies to solve or represent equations or expressions.
  - Anchor M7.D.2.2 Create and/or interpret expressions, equations or inequalities that model problem situations.

Grade 8

Algebraic Concepts

- Demonstrate an understanding of patterns, relations and functions.
  - Anchor M8.D.1.1 Analyze, extend or develop descriptions of patterns or functions.
- Represent and/or analyze mathematical situations using numbers, symbols, words, tables, and/or graphs.
Anchor M8.D.2.1 Select and/or use a strategy to simplify an expression, solve an equation or inequality and/or check the solution for accuracy.

Anchor M8.D.2.2 Create and/or interpret expressions, equations or inequalities that model problem situations.

Geometry

- Analyze characteristics and properties of two- and three- dimensional geometric shapes and demonstrate understanding of geometric relationships.

  Anchor M8.C.1.1 Identify, use, and/or describe properties of angles, triangles, quadrilaterals, circles, pyramids, cubes, prisms, spheres, cones and/or cylinders.

  Anchor M8.C.1.2 Compute measures of sides of right triangles using the Pythagorean Theorem.

- Locate points or describe relationships using the coordinate plane.

  Anchor M8.C.3.1 Plot and/or identify ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.

Numbers and Operations

- Understand the meaning of operations, use operations and understand how they relate to each other.

  Anchor M8.A.2.1 Complete calculations by applying the order of operations

  Anchor M8.A.2.2 Represent or solve problems using rates, ratios, proportions and/or percents

Appendix B outlines all the skills I identified as a result of the PSSA mathematics data analysis.
Components

The Philadelphia Do Now! Program consisted of five modules. The first module provided a 7-week Start-Up to review and practiced basic reading and math skills. The Start-Up module provided instruction in reading and math skills for which students typically need review. Three of the modules focused on the identified critical skills and test-taking strategies to prepare students for success on the state test. The final modules consisted of two practice tests to measure student progress and provide a simulated testing environment to build student confidence. These five modules, based on the assessment anchors for each grade, ensured that Philadelphia students using the program received comprehensive customized instruction to build the skills necessary for success in future reading and math courses and on the PSSA.

The Do Now! Reading strategically integrated key PA assessment anchors and test-taking strategies to empower students to read and comprehend literary and nonfiction grade-level text successfully. Deliberate, explicit instruction along with student engagement in meaningful discussions builds purposeful readers to apply critical skills like making inferences and drawing conclusion, identifying stated and implied main idea, utilizing graphic organizers, and analysis of story elements. The focus skills are then applied to general and skill-specific test-taking strategies.

The concept and skill lessons within each unit of the Do Now! Math program provided students with just-in-time instruction in key PA assessment anchors in proportion to the categories outlined in the PSSA Test Blueprint for math. Additionally, students receive important instruction in test-taking strategies and in how to successfully
answer open-ended response items. Each page of the Do Now! math student workbooks included one or more example problems that present concepts or skills visually whenever possible. The examples were followed by practice problems in which students applied the new skill, concept, or strategy learned.

The teacher edition for each component consisted of explicit teacher dialogue to help the teacher present the lesson effectively and efficiently. The detailed lesson support in each lesson ensured high-quality instruction and teachers of any experience level could be successful using the program. Also, answer keys for all examples and practice problems are included.

The practice tests were strategically administered and were based upon the previous lessons. The test format mirrored the PSSA, consisting of multiple choice questions and open-ended and constructed responses. There were an adequate number of problems associated with each lesson to assure schools could appropriately determine if the student has grasped the skill and concept. Answer keys were provided for the multiple choice questions and anchor papers were provided to provide teachers with standard answers for the open-ended and constructed responses. If students did not show progress on the practice tests the teachers would develop small groups based upon instructional deficiencies, reteach the content and provide the student with additional practice lessons. Appendix E.C and E.D are sample units from the Philadelphia Do Now!
Professional Development

The School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS) was the main source of training for teachers at the school level. The SBIS received one day of training by national consultants. The training focused on the purpose of the program, how it was to be implemented and monitored. The expectation was the SBIS would conduct turnaround training to all teaching staff at their school. The principals also participated in one half day of training. The half day of training provided the principals with an overview of the program, outlined the expectations for teachers and SBISs, “look-fors” related to effective implementation and an overall monitoring plan.

Implementation and Monitoring

The program was taught daily for 20 minutes, in reading and in math. The mini lesson began with the teacher re-teaching the skill, modeling the various elements and revisiting the academic language. The teacher guide provided teachers with an explicit framework to ensure the skill was appropriately revisited and retaught and the overall instructional delivery was aligned and on grade level. This instruction was immediately followed by the students applying the strategies and systems learned by completing and responding to the practice problems, passages and or open-ended and constructed responses.

The Philadelphia Do Now! was monitored daily to assure the lessons are taking place. Teachers charted student progress by unit to determine who made progress and who still needed additional support. Open-ended and constructed responses were collected, scored and charted to monitor student progress. Lastly, the practice tests were scored and
assessed to determine what skills needed to be revisited and what student needed additional support.
Grade 3

**Anchor R3.A.1** Understand fiction appropriate to grade level.

R3.A.1.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions based on text.

**Eligible Content**

R3.A.1.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.

R3.A.1.6 Identify genre of text

**Eligible Content**

R3.A.1.6.1 Identify intended purpose of text.

R3.A.2 Understand nonfiction appropriate to grade level.

**Eligible Content**

R3.A.2.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.

R3.A.2.6 Identify genre of text

**Eligible Content**

R3.A.2.6.1 Identify intended purpose of text.

**Anchor R3.B.1**: Understand components within and between texts.

R3.B.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, and describe components of fiction and literary nonfiction.

**Eligible Content**

R3.B.1.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, and/or describe components of fiction and literary nonfiction.

- **CHARACTER** (may also be called narrator, speaker, subject of a biography)
  - Identify, interpret, compare, and/or describe character actions, motives, dialogue, emotions/feelings, traits, and relationships among characters within fictional or literary nonfictional text. Identify, interpret, compare, and/or describe the relationship between characters and other components of text.

- **Setting**
  - Identify, interpret, compare and/or describe the setting (when or where a story or personal narrative takes place.)

- **Plot** (may also be called action)
  - Identify, interpret, compare and/or describe elements of the plot (conflict/problem, sequence of events, cause and effect relationships in the plot, how the problem was solved).

R3.B.1.2 Make connections between texts
Eligible Content

R3.B.1.2.1 Identify, interpret, compare and/or describe connections between texts.
R3.B.2.1 Identify and interpret figurative language in fiction and nonfiction.

Eligible Content

R3.B.1.2.1 Identify and/or interpret examples of personification in text.

Anchor R3.B.3 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text.
R3.B.3.1 Differentiate fact from opinion in nonfictional text

Eligible Content

R3.B.3.1.1 Identify and/or interpret statements of fact and opinion in nonfictional text.
R3.B.3.2 Distinguish between essential and nonessential information within text.

Eligible Content

R3.B.3.2.1 Identify exaggeration (bias) where present in nonfictional text
R3.B.3.3 Identify, compare, explain, and interpret how text organization clarifies meaning of nonfictional text.

Eligible Content

R5.B.3.3.1 Identify and/or interpret text organization, including sequence, question/answer, comparison/contrast, cause/effect or problem/solution.
R5.B.3.3.2 Use headings to locate information in a passage, or identify content that would best fit in a specific section of text.
R5.B.3.3.3 Interpret graphics and charts and/or make connections between text and the content of graphics and charts.
R3.B.3.3.4 Identify, compare, explain, and interpret how text organization clarifies meaning of nonfictional text.

Grade 4

Anchor R4.A.1 Understand fiction appropriate to grade level.
R4.A.1.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions based on text.

Eligible Content

R4.A.1.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R4.A.1.6 Identify genre of text  
Eligible Content  
R4.A.1.6.1 Identify intended purpose of text.

R4.A.2 Understand nonfiction appropriate to grade level.  
Eligible Content  
R4.A.2.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.  
R4.A.2.6 Identify genre of text  
Eligible Content  
R4.A.2.6.1 Identify intended purpose of text.

Anchor R4.B.1: Understand components within and between texts.  
R4.B.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, and describe components of fiction and literary nonfiction.  

Eligible Content  
R4.B.1.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, and describe components of fiction and literary nonfiction.  
- **CHARACTER** (may also be called narrator, speaker, subject of a biography)  
  o Identify, interpret, compare, and/or describe character actions, motives, dialogue, emotions/feelings, traits, and relationships among characters within fictional or literary nonfictional text. Identify, interpret, compare, and/or describe the relationship between characters and other components of text.  
- **Setting**  
  o Identify, interpret, compare and/or describe the setting (when or where a story or personal narrative takes place.)  
- **Plot** (may also be called action)  
  o Identify, interpret, compare and/or describe elements of the plot (conflict/problem, sequence of events, cause and effect relationships in the plot, how the problem was solved).

R4.B.1.2 Make connections between texts  
Eligible Content  
R4.B.1.2.1 Identify, interpret, compare and/or describe connections between texts.

R4.B.2.1 Identify and interpret figurative language in fiction and nonfiction.  
Eligible Content  
R4.B.2.1.1 Identify and interpret literary devices in fictional and literary nonfictional text.  
R4.B.2.1.2 Identify and/or interpret examples of similes in text.  
R4.B.2.1.3 Identify and/or interpret examples of alliteration in text when its use is presumed intentional

Anchor R4.B.3 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text.  
R4.B.3.1 Differentiate fact from opinion in nonfictional text
Eligible Content
R4.B.3.1.1 Identify and/or interpret statements of fact and opinion in nonfictional text.
R4.B.3.2 Distinguish between essential and nonessential information within text.

Eligible Content
R4.B.3.2.1 Identify exaggeration (bias) where present in nonfictional text.
R4.B.3.3 Identify, compare, explain, and interpret how text organization clarifies meaning of nonfictional text.

Eligible Content
R4.B.3.3.1 Identify and/or interpret text organization, including sequence, question/answer, comparison/contrast, cause/effect, or problem/solution.
R4.B.3.3.2 Use headings to locate information in a passage, or identify content that would best fit in a specific section of text.
R4.B.3.3.3 Interpret graphics and charts and/or make connections between text and the content of graphics and charts.
R4.B.3.3.4 Identify, compare, explain, and/or interpret the sequence of steps in a

Grade 5
Anchor R5.A.1 Understand fiction appropriate to grade level.
R5.A.1.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions, and make generalizations based on text.

Eligible Content
R5.A.1.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R5.A.1.3.2 Cite evidence from text to support generalizations.
R5.A.1.6 Identify and describe, genre of text.

Eligible Content
R5.A.1.6.1 Identify intended purpose of text.
R5.A.1.6.2 Identify and/or describe examples of text that support its intended purpose.

Anchor R5.A.2 Understand nonfiction appropriate to grade level.
R5.A.2.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions, and make generalizations based on text.

Eligible Content
R5.A.2.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R5.A.2.3.2 Cite evidence from text to support generalizations.
R5.A.2.6 Identify and describe genre of text.

Eligible Content
R5.A.2.6.1 Identify intended purpose of text.
R5.A.2.6.2 Identify and/or describe examples of text that support its intended purpose.
Anchor R5.B.1 Understand components within and between texts.
R5.B.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and analyze components of fiction and literary nonfiction.

Eligible Content
R5.B.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze components of fiction and literary nonfiction.

- **CHARACTER** (may also be called narrator, speaker, subject of a biography):
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe and/or analyze character actions, motives, dialogue, emotions/feelings, traits, and relationships among characters within fictional or literary nonfictional text.
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe and/or analyze the relationship between characters and other components of text.

- **Setting**
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the setting of fiction or literary nonfiction.
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between setting and other components of text.

- **Plot** (may also be called action):
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze elements of the plot (conflict, rising action, climax and/or resolution).
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between elements of the plot and other components of text.

- **Theme**
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the theme of fiction or literary nonfiction.
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between the theme and other components of text.

R5.B.1.2 Make connections between texts

Eligible Content
R5.B.1.2.1 Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze, connections between texts.

Anchor R5.B.3 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text.
R5.B.3.3 Identify and interpret, how text organization clarifies meaning of nonfictional text.

Eligible Content
R5.B.3.3.1 Identify and/or interpret text organization, including sequence, question/answer, comparison contrast, cause/effect or problem/solution.
R5.B.3.3.2 Use headings to locate information in a passage, or identify content that would best fit in a specific section of text.
R5.B.3.3.3 Interpret graphics and charts and/or make connections between text and the content of graphics and charts.
R5.B.3.3.4 Identify, compare, explain, interpret, describe, the sequence of steps in a list of directions.

Grade 6
Anchor R6.A.1 Understand fiction appropriate to grade level.
R6.A.1.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions, and make generalizations based on text.
Eligible Content
R6.A.1.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R6.A.1.3.2 Cite evidence from text to support generalizations.

R6.A.1.6 Identify and describe genre of text.

Eligible Content
R6.A.1.6.1 Identify intended purpose of text.
R6.A.1.6.2 Identify and/or describe examples of text that support its intended purpose.

R6.A.2.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions, and make generalizations based on text.

Eligible Content
R6.A.2.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R6.A.2.3.2 Cite evidence from text to support generalizations.

R6.A.2.6 Identify and describe genre of text.

Eligible Content
R6.A.2.6.1 Identify intended purpose of text.
R6.A.2.6.2 Identify and/or describe examples of text that support its intended purpose.

Anchor
R6.B.1 Understand components within and between texts.
R6.B.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and analyze components of fiction and literary nonfiction.

Eligible Content
R6.B.1.1.1 Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze components of fiction and literary nonfiction.

- **CHARACTER** (may also be called narrator, speaker, subject of a biography):
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe and/or analyze character actions, motives, dialogue, emotions/feelings, traits, and relationships among characters within fictional or literary nonfictional text.
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between characters and other components of text.

- **Setting**
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the setting of fiction or literary nonfiction.
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between setting and other components of text.

- **Plot** (may also be called action):
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze elements of the plot (conflict, rising action, climax and/or resolution). Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between elements of the plot and other components of text.

- **Theme**
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the theme of fiction or literary nonfiction.
  - Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between the theme and other components of text.
R6.B.1.2 Make connections between texts

Eligible Content
R6.B.1.2.1 Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze, connections between texts.

Anchor R6.B.3 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text.
R6.B.3.3 Identify and interpret, how text organization clarifies meaning of nonfictional text.

Eligible Content
R6.B.3.3.1 Identify and/or interpret text organization, including sequence, question/answer, comparison contrast, cause/effect or problem/solution.
R6.B.3.3.2 Use headings to locate information in a passage, or identify content that would best fit in a specific section of text.
R6.B.3.3.3 Interpret graphics and charts and/or make connections between text and the content of graphics and charts.
R6.B.3.3.4 Identify, compare, explain, interpret, describe, the sequence of steps in a list of directions.

Grade 7

Anchor R7.A.1 Understand fiction appropriate to grade level.
R7.A.1.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions, and make generalizations based on text.

Eligible Content
R7.A.1.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R7.A.1.3.2 Cite evidence from text to support generalizations.

R7.A.1.6 Identify, describe and analyze genre of text.

Eligible Content
R7.A.1.6.1 Identify and/or describe intended purpose of text.
R7.A.1.6.2 Describe and/or analyze examples of text that support its intended purpose.

R7.A.2.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions, and make generalizations based on text.

Eligible Content
R7.A.2.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R7.A.2.3.2 Cite evidence from text to support generalizations.

R7.A.2.6 Identify, describe, and analyze genre of text.

Eligible Content
R7.A.2.6.1 Identify and/or describe intended purpose of text.
R7.A.2.6.2 Identify and/or analyze examples of text that support its intended purpose.
Anchor R7.B.1 Understand components within and between texts.

R7.B.1.1 Interpret, compare, describe, analyze, and evaluate components of fiction and literary nonfiction.

Eligible Content

R7.B.1.1.1 Interpret, compare, describe, analyze and/or evaluate the relationships among the following within fiction and literary nonfiction.

- **Character** (may also be called narrator, speaker, subject of a biography):
  - Interpret, compare, describe analyze and/or evaluate character actions, motives, dialogue, emotions/feelings, traits, and relationships among characters within fictional or literary nonfictional text.
  - Interpret, compare, describe, analyze and/or evaluate the relationship between characters and other components of text.

- **Setting**
  - Interpret, compare describe, analyze and/or evaluate the setting of fiction or literary nonfiction.
  - Interpret, compare describe, analyze and/or evaluate the relationship between setting and other components of text.

- **Plot** (may also be called action):
  - Interpret, compare describe, analyze and/or evaluate elements of the plot (conflict, rising action, climax and/or resolution). Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between elements of the plot and other components of text.

- **Theme**
  - Interpret, compare, describe, analyze and/or evaluate the theme of fiction or literary nonfiction.
  - Interpret, compare, describe, analyze and/or evaluate the relationship between the theme and other components of text.

R7.B.1.2 Make connections between texts

Eligible Content

R7.B.1.2.1 Interpret, compare, describe, analyze, and/or evaluate connections between texts.

Anchor R7.B.3 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text.

R7.B.3.3 Identify and interpret, how text organization clarifies meaning of nonfictional text.

Eligible Content

R7.B.3.3.1 Identify interpret and/or analyze text organization, including sequence, question/answer, comparison contrast, cause/effect or problem/solution.

R7.B.3.3.2 Identify content that would fit in a specific section of text

R7.B.3.3.3 Interpret graphics and charts and/or make connections between text and the content of graphics and charts.

R7.B.3.3.4, Identify, compare, explain interpret, describe, and/or analyze the sequence of steps in a list of directions
Grade 8

**Anchor R8.A.1** Understand fiction appropriate to grade level.
R8.A.1.3 Make inferences, draw conclusions, and make generalizations based on text.

**Eligible Content**
R8.A.1.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R8.A.1.3.2 Cite evidence from text to support generalizations.

**R8.A.1.6** Identify, describe and analyze genre of text.

**Eligible Content**
R8.A.1.6.1 Identify and/or analyze intended purpose of text.
R8.A.1.6.2 Describe and/or analyze examples of text that support its intended purpose.

**R8.A.2.3** Make inferences, draw conclusions, and make generalizations based on text.

**Eligible Content**
R8.A.2.3.1 Make inferences and/or draw conclusions based on information from text.
R8.A.2.3.2 Cite evidence from text to support generalizations.

**R8.A.2.6** Identify, describe, and analyze genre of text.

**Eligible Content**
R8.A.2.6.1 Identify and/or describe intended purpose of text.
R8.A.2.6.2 Describe and/or analyze examples of text that support its intended purpose.

**Anchor R8.B.1** Understand components within and between texts.
R8.B.1.1 Interpret, compare, describe, analyze, and evaluate components of fiction and literary nonfiction.

**Eligible Content**
R8.B.1.1.1 Interpret, compare, describe, analyze and/or evaluate the relationships among the following within fiction and literary nonfiction.

- **Character** (may also be called narrator, speaker, subject of a biography):
  - Interpret, compare, describe, analyze and/or evaluate character actions, motives, dialogue, emotions/feelings, traits, and relationships among characters within fictional or literary nonfictional text.
  - Interpret, compare, describe, analyze and/or evaluate the relationship between characters and other components of text.

- **Setting**
  - Interpret, compare describe, analyze and/or evaluate the setting of fiction or literary nonfiction.
  - Interpret, compare describe, analyze and/or evaluate the relationship between setting and other components of text.

- **Plot** (may also be called action):
  - Interpret, compare describe, analyze and/or evaluate elements of the plot (conflict, rising action, climax and/or resolution). Identify, interpret, compare, describe, and/or analyze the relationship between elements of the plot and other components of text.
R8.B.1.2 Make connections between texts

**Eligible Content**

R8.B.1.2.1 Interpret, compare, describe, analyze, and/or evaluate connections between texts.

**Anchor R8.B.3** Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text.

R8.B.3.3 Identify and interpret, how text organization clarifies meaning of nonfictional text.

**Eligible Content**

R8.B.3.3.1 Identify, interpret and/or analyze text organization, including sequence, question/answer, comparison contrast, cause/effect or problem/solution.

R8.B.3.3.2 Identify content that would fit in a specific section of text.

R8.B.3.3.3 Interpret graphics and charts and/or make connections between text and the content of graphics and charts.

R8.B.3.3.4 Identify, compare, explain, interpret, describe, analyze the sequence of steps in a list of directions.
Grade 3

Numbers and Operations

- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems
  
  **Anchor M3.A.1.1:** Apply place-value concepts and numeration to counting, ordering, grouping and equivalency.

  **Eligible content:**

  M3.A.1.1.2 Differentiate between and/or give examples of even and odd number (limit to 3 digits).

  M3.A.1.1.3 Compare two whole numbers using greater than (>), less than (<) or equal to (=) (up through 9,999).

  M3.A.1.1.4 Order a set of whole numbers from least to greatest or greatest to least (up through 9,999; limit sets to no more than four numbers).

  M3.A.1.1.5 Match a symbolic representation of numbers to appropriate whole numbers (e.g., base ten blocks, 7 hundreds, 4 tens and 8 ones, etc).

**Anchor M3.A.1.3** Count, compare and make change using a collection of coins and one dollar bills.

**Eligible content**

M3.A.1.3.1 Count a collection of bills and coins less than $5.00 (penny, nickel, dime, quarter, dollar). Money may be represented as 15 cents, 15¢ or $0.15.

M3.A.1.3.2 Compare total values of combinations of coins less than $5.00 (penny, nickel, dime, quarter, dollar).

M3.A.1.3.3 Make change for an amount up to $5.00 with no more than $2.00 change given (penny, nickel, dime, quarter, dollar).

- Compute accurately and fluently and make reasonable estimates.
  
  **Anchor M3.A.3.1** Solve problems using addition, subtraction and multiplication (straight computation and word problems).

  **Eligible content**

  M3.A.3.1.1 Solve single- and double-digit addition and subtraction problems with and without regrouping in vertical or horizontal form.
M3.A.3.1.2 Solve problems involving multiplication through the 9’s tables through 9x5.

M3.A.3.1.3 Solve triple digit addition and subtraction problems without regrouping in vertical or horizontal form.

**Anchor M3.A.3.2** Use estimation skills to arrive at conclusions.

**Eligible content**

M3.A.3.2.1 Estimate sums and differences of quantities; round 2-digit numbers to the nearest 10, and 3 digit numbers to the nearest 100, before computing (limit to two numbers).

---

**Grade 4**

**Numbers and Operations**

- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems.

  **Anchor M4.A.1.1** Use models and/or words to represent quantities as decimals, fractions or mixed numbers.

  **Eligible content**

  M4.A.1.1.1 Write the fraction or decimal, including mixed numbers, which corresponds to a drawing or set – no simplification necessary.

  M4.A.1.1.2 Create a drawing or set that represents a given fraction or decimal, including mixed numbers (through the tenths).

  M4.A.1.1.3 Match the standard number form to the word form of decimal numbers (through the tenths place).

  M4.A.1.1.4 Write whole numbers in expanded, standard and/or word form through 6 digits (example of standard to expanded form: 43,076 =40,000+3000+70+6).

  **Anchor M4.A.1.2** Compare quantities and magnitudes of numbers.

  **Eligible content**

  M4.A.1.2.1 Locate/identify fractions or decimals on a number line (decimals and fractions through the tenths – do not mix fractions and decimals).

  M4.A.1.2.2 Compare and/or order whole numbers through 6 digits and amounts of money to $100 (limit sets for ordering, to no more than 4 numbers).

  **Anchor M4.A.1.3** Develop and/or apply number theory concepts to represent numbers in various ways.

  **Eligible content**

  M4.A.1.3.1 Find/list/identify all factors through 10 of any given number

  M4.A.1.3.2 Find/list/identify multiples of a number, where the multiples do not exceed 100

- Understand the meaning of operations, use operations and understand how they relate to each other.
Anchor **M4.A.2.1** Use operations to solve problems (may include word problems).

**Eligible content**

**M4.A.2.1.1** Solve problems involving all operations with whole numbers, and/or explain the solution (limit to two-step problems; e.g. multiply then add single digit multipliers and divisors).

**M4.A.2.1.2** Solve problems involving addition or subtraction with decimals through the tenths or money to the cent and/or explain the solution. Limit to two-step problems.

- Compute accurately and fluently and make reasonable estimates.
  Anchor **M4.A.3.1** Apply rounding and/or estimation strategies to solve problems.

**Eligible content**

**M4.A.3.1.1** Round whole numbers to the nearest ten, hundred, thousand, ten-thousand or hundred-thousand.

**M4.A.3.1.2** Round amounts of money to the nearest dollar.

**M4.A.3.1.3** Estimate the answer to addition, subtraction and multiplication problems using whole numbers through 6 digits (for multiplication, no more than 2 digits X 1 digit, excluding powers of 10).

---

**Grade 5**

**Numbers and Operations**

- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems.
  Anchor **M5.A.1.1** Express numbers in equivalent forms.

**Eligible content**

**M5.A.1.1.1** Use expanded notation to represent whole numbers or decimals (whole numbers less than 10,000,000 and decimals through hundredths).

**Anchor** **M5.A.1.2** Demonstrate understanding of place value of whole numbers and decimals.

**Eligible content**

**M5.A.1.2.1** Match the standard form to the word form of decimal numbers through the hundredths.

**M5.A.1.2.2** Identify the place value of a digit (from millions through hundredths).

**Anchor** **M5.A.1.3** Compare quantities or magnitudes of numbers.
Eligible content

M5.A.1.3.1 Compare whole numbers through 9 digits using the words more, less, equal, least, most, greater than, less than or the symbols <, >, =.

M5.A.1.3.2 Compare and/or order decimals through the hundredths. (Limit sets for ordering to no more than 4 numbers.)

M5.A.1.3.3 Compare proper fractions through 16ths with like and unlike denominators.

Anchor M5.A.1.4 Use simple applications of negative numbers (number line, counting, temperature)

Eligible content

M5.A.1.4.1 Locate/Identify integers on a number line (greater than or equal to -20).

M5.A.1.4.2 Identify negative temperatures on a thermometer (through -20°C or F).

Anchor M5.A.1.5 Use or develop models to represent fractions and/or mixed numbers.

Eligible content

M5.A.1.5.1 Use or develop regions and/or sets (e.g., circle graph, base ten blocks) to model fractions and mixed numbers through hundredths (may include reducing the fractions).

Anchor M5.A.1.6 Apply number theory concepts (i.e., primes, factors, multiples, composites).

Eligible content

M5.A.1.6.1 Define/list/identify prime and composite numbers less than or equal to 100.

M5.A.1.6.2 Define/list/identify factors and/or multiples of a given whole number less than or equal to 50.

- Understand the meaning of operations, use operations and understand how they relate to each other.

Anchor M5.A.2.1 Solve problems involving decimals, fractions and/or whole numbers (straight computation or word problems).

Eligible content

M5.A.2.1.1 Solve problems involving addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of whole numbers (multipliers up to 2 digit– divisors one digit) and decimals including money (answer through hundredths – no division with decimals).

M5.A.2.1.2 Solve problems involving addition and subtraction of fractions (through 16ths – like and unlike denominators – for unlike denominators, the LCD must be one of the given denominators).

M5.A.2.1.3 Choose the correct operation(s) to solve a problem (no more than 2 operations).
• Compute accurately and fluently and make reasonable estimates.

Anchor M5.A.3.1 Apply estimation strategies to a variety of problems.

Eligible content

M5.A.3.1.1 Round whole numbers through millions and decimals through hundredths

M5.A.3.1.2 Use estimation to solve problems involving whole numbers and/or decimals (up to 2-digit multipliers, single-digit divisors or multiples of 10; whole numbers through thousands and decimals through hundredths).

Anchor M5.A.3.2 Compute accurately without the use of a calculator (straight computation or 1 operation word problems).

Eligible content

M5.A.3.2.1 Use addition, subtraction, multiplication and division to compute accurately without a calculator (multipliers up to 2 digits, single-digit divisors or multiples of 10 – whole numbers through thousands and decimals through hundredths - no division with decimals).

Grade 6

Numbers and Operations

• Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems.

Anchor M6.A.1.1 Express numbers in equivalent forms

Eligible content

M6.A.1.1.1 Represent common percents as fractions and/or decimals (e.g., 25% = \( \frac{1}{4} = .25 \)) – common percents are 1%, 10%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%.

M6.A.1.1.2 Convert between fractions and decimals and/or differentiate between a terminating decimal and a repeating decimal.

M6.A.1.1.3 Represent a number in exponential form (e.g., \( 10 \times 10 \times 10 = 10^3 \)).

M6.A.1.1.4 Represent a mixed number as an improper fraction.

Anchor M6.A.1.2 Compare quantities and/or magnitudes of numbers.

Eligible content

M6.A.1.2.1 Compare and/or order whole numbers, mixed numbers, fractions and/or decimals (do not mix fractions and decimals – decimals through thousandths).

Anchor M6.A.1.3 Apply number theory concepts (i.e., factors, multiples).

Eligible content

M6.A.1.3.1 Find the Greatest Common Factor (GCF) of two numbers (through 50) and/or use the GCF to simplify fractions.
M6.A.1.3.2 Find the Least Common Multiple (LCM) of two numbers (through 50) and/or use the LCM to find the common denominator of two fractions.

M6.A.1.3.3 Use divisibility rules for 2, 3, 5 and/or 10 to draw conclusions and/or solve problems.

Anchor M6.A.1.4 Use or develop models to represent percents.

Eligible content

M6.A.1.4.1 Model percents (through 100%) using drawings, graphs and/or sets (e.g., circle graph, base ten blocks, etc)

Algebraic Concepts

- Represent and/or analyze mathematical situations using numbers, symbols, words, tables, and/or graphs.
  Anchor M6.D.2.1 Select and/or use appropriate strategies to solve number sentences.

Eligible content

M6.D.2.1.1 Identify the inverse operation needed to solve a one-step equation.

M6.D.2.1.2 Solve a one-step equation (i.e., using the inverse operation - whole numbers only).

Anchor M6.D.2.2 Create and/or interpret expressions or equations that model problem situations.

Eligible content

M6.D.2.2.1 Match an equation or expression involving one variable, to a verbal math situation (one operation only).

Grade 7

Numbers and Operations

- Demonstrate an understanding of numbers, ways of representing numbers, relationships among numbers and number systems.
  Anchor M7.A.1.1 Express numbers in equivalent forms.

Eligible content

M7.A.1.1.1 Convert between fractions, decimals and/or percents (e.g., 20% = 0.2 = 1/5) (terminating decimals only)

Anchor M7.A.1.2 Compare quantities and/or magnitudes of numbers
Eligible content

M7.A.1.2.1 Compare and/or order integers, mixed numbers, fractions and decimals (fractions and decimals may be mixed – no more than 5 numbers in a set to be ordered).

M7.A.1.2.2 Locate/identify decimals, fractions, mixed numbers and/or integers on a number line (a mix of these number forms may be on the same number line).

- Compute accurately and fluently and make reasonable estimates.
  Anchor M7.A.3.1 Apply estimation strategies to a variety of problems.

Eligible content

M7.A.3.1.1 Estimate answers to problems involving whole numbers, decimals, fractions or mixed numbers.

Anchor M7.A.3.2 Compute accurately with and without use of a calculator.

Eligible content

M7.A.3.2.1 Solve problems involving operations (+, -, x, ) of whole numbers, decimals, fractions, or mixed numbers (straight computation or word problems)

M7.A.3.2.2 Solve problems involving addition and subtraction of integers.

Algebraic Concepts

- Represent and/or analyze mathematical situations using numbers, symbols, words, tables, and/or graphs.
  Anchor M7.D.2.1 Select and/or use appropriate strategies to solve or represent equations or expressions.

Eligible content

M7.D.2.1.1 Select and/or use appropriate strategies to solve one-step equations (no negative numbers).

M7.D.2.1.2 Use substitution of one and/or two variables to simplify expressions (whole numbers only – use order of operations).

Anchor M7.D.2.2 Create and/or interpret expressions, equations or inequalities that model problem situations.

Eligible content

M7.D.2.2.1 Identify expressions, equations or inequalities that model mathematical situations (using whole numbers or decimals, no more than two operations and one variable).

Grade 8

Algebraic Concepts

- Demonstrate an understanding of patterns, relations and functions.
  Anchor M8.D.1.1 Analyze, extend or develop descriptions of patterns or functions.
Eligible content

M8.D.1.1.1 Continue a numeric or algebraic pattern (pattern must show 3 repetitions – may include up to 2 operations, squares and square roots).

M8.D.1.1.2 Find missing elements in numeric or geometric patterns and/or functions (may be given a table or rule – pattern must show 3 repetitions).

M8.D.1.1.3 Determine the rule of a function (given elements in an input-output table, chart or list – limit to linear functions).

- Represent and/or analyze mathematical situations using numbers, symbols, words, tables, and/or graphs.
  
  Anchor M8.D.2.1 Select and/or use a strategy to simplify an expression, solve an equation or inequality and/or check the solution for accuracy.

Eligible content

M8.D.2.1.1 Solve one- or two-step equations and inequalities (should not include absolute values – one variable only)

M8.D.2.1.2 Use substitution to check the accuracy of a given value for an equation or inequality (simple inequalities with one variable).

M8.D.2.1.3 Determine the value of an algebraic expression by simplifying and/or substituting a number for the variable.

Anchor M8.D.2.2 Create and/or interpret expressions, equations or inequalities that model problem situations.

Eligible content

M8.D.2.2.1 Match a written situation to its numeric and/or algebraic expression, equation or inequality (up to two variables in equations or expressions – one variable with inequalities).

M8.D.2.2.2 Write and/or solve an equation for a given problem situation (one variable only).

Geometry

- Analyze characteristics and properties of two- and three- dimensional geometric shapes and demonstrate understanding of geometric relationships.
  
  Anchor M8.C.1.1 Identify, use, and/or describe properties of angles, triangles, quadrilaterals, circles, pyramids, cubes, prisms, spheres, cones and/or cylinders.

Eligible content

M8.C.1.1.1 Match the three-dimensional figure with its net (cube, cylinder, cone, prism, pyramid). Any measurements used should be consistent in the stem and answer choices.

M8.C.1.1.2 Define, identify and/or use properties of angles formed by intersecting lines (complementary, supplementary, adjacent and/or vertical angles).
M8.C.1.3 Define, identify and/or use properties of angles formed when two parallel lines are cut by a transversal (alternate interior, alternate exterior, vertical corresponding).

Anchor M8.C.1.2 Compute measures of sides of right triangles using the Pythagorean Theorem.

Eligible content

M8.C.1.2.1 Use the Pythagorean Theorem to find the measure of a missing side of a right triangle (formula provided on the reference sheet – whole numbers only)

• Locate points or describe relationships using the coordinate plane.
  M8.C.3.1 Plot and/or identify ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.

Eligible content

M8.C.3.1.1 Plot, locate or identify ordered pairs on a coordinate plane (the point may be a vertex of a polygon).

Numbers and Operations

Anchor Understand the meaning of operations, use operations and understand how they relate to each other.

M8.A.2.1 Complete calculations by applying the order of operations

Eligible content

M8.A.2.1.1 Simplify numeric expressions involving integers, using the order of operations. (May include all types of grouping symbols No combining negatives with exponents [4-3] or compound exponents)

M8.A.2.2 Represent or solve problems using rates, ratios, proportions and/or percents.

Eligible content

M8.A.2.2.1 Solve problems involving percents (e.g., tax, discounts, etc) Do not include percent increase or decrease.

M8.A.2.2.2 Represent or solve rate problems (e.g., unit rates, simple interest, distance, etc.) Students may be asked to solve for any term (formulas provided on the reference sheet for distance and interest).
Appendix E.C

Sample Literacy Unit

Do Now!  Unit 1 Passage

Totem Poles
by Christopher Jenkins

1 Totem poles are important in the lives of the Northwest Coast Indians. They have been carved so that families can preserve their history.

The First Poles
2 The first totem poles were carved long ago. It was a time before people in the Northwest wrote down stories. People needed a way to remember history. Older people told young people stories from their history. The carvings on totem poles told the stories. They helped people remember their history.

Carvings with Meanings
3 Totem poles look like tall wooden posts. People usually carve them from the trunks of cedar trees. The trunks are covered with beautiful carvings from top to bottom. Each carving on a totem pole has a special meaning. Human figures are family ancestors. A raven stands for knowledge and creation. The raven is also curious and causes change. A bear stands for strength and teaching. A killer whale represents a guardian. A wolf means intelligence and represents family.

Raising a Pole
4 Raising a totem pole is hard work. First, people dig a deep hole. Then they carry the finished totem pole to the hole. A totem pole is heavy, so many people work together to carry it. One end of the totem pole is not carved. This end goes into the hole. Then the pole is raised. There are ropes on the totem pole. People on one side pull the ropes. People on the other side push the pole up.

Still Standing
5 Raising a totem pole is a happy time. It calls for a special ceremony. Drums play all day long. People sing and dance to the beat of the drums.

Many of the stories on ancient totem poles are lost today. The people who knew them are gone. The totem poles remain, though. They remind us of the colorful history of the people of the Northwest Coast.
Do Now

Main Idea

Name __________________________ Class __________________________ Date ____________

Answer the following questions about "Totem Poles."

1. What is the main idea of the whole passage?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. What is the section The First Poles about?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. What details are given about the first totem poles?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. What is the main idea of the section called The First Poles?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Main Idea and Supporting Details

Write the main idea and supporting details for each of the following sections from “Totem Poles.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Main Idea</th>
<th>Supporting Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carvings with Meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising a Pole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© 2013 Cambridge, all rights reserved.
Complete the word web for *ceremony* or *preserve*.

- **Definition**
- **Synonyms**
- **Antonyms**
- **Part of Speech**
- **Example Sentence**
Test-Taking Strategy

Preview the Questions
Before reading the passage, preview the questions. Previewing the questions helps you set a purpose for reading. As you read, keep the questions in mind and look for the answers.

Totem Poles
Totem poles look like tall, wooden posts. They are made from the trunks of tall cedar trees. The trunks are covered with beautiful carvings from top to bottom. Totem poles are important in the lives of the Northwest Coast Indians. They have been carved so that families can preserve their history. The first totem poles were carved long ago. It was a time before the people wrote down stories. People needed a way to remember history. Older people told young people the stories from their history. Totem poles helped people remember the stories.

1. What was an important reason for carving a totem pole?
   A to give the totem pole to a family member as a special gift
   B to help people remember their history
   C to learn how to paint beautiful animals
   D to give people something to write about

2. What are totem poles made from?
   A wooden blocks
   B carvings
   C cedar trees
   D written stories
Pioneer Schools
by Stephanie Lieu

One-Room Schoolhouses

1 Pioneer children went to school in the summer and in the winter. They had to stay home in the spring and fall because their families needed them. The children had to help work the farm. Sometimes their school didn’t have a teacher, so they didn’t get to go to school at all.

2 Schools were not like the schools you go to today. They only had one room. The room was hot in summer and cold in winter. There was only a small wood-burning stove to heat the room. One teacher taught children of all ages. The teacher sometimes had help, though. The oldest students often helped the younger ones with their schoolwork.

At School

3 Schools did not have many supplies or books. Children had slates that they used to write on. They could erase the work they did on the slates and use them over and over. Children took the few books they had from home. Families were proud to own books. They were used over and over again by the children in the family. Sometimes they were handed down from parents to children.

4 Children in pioneer schools learned only a few subjects. Reading, writing, and math were most important. Students also learned history. Much of the school day was spent memorizing math facts and poems. Students memorized dates and grammar rules, too.

5 Like today, most children enjoyed lunchtime. They brought their lunch in pails. Lunchtime was the time to relax, eat, and play games together. When lunchtime was over, the teacher rang a bell. That was the signal to stop playing and start working again.
Read the passage “Pioneer Schools.” Choose the best answers.

1. What is paragraph 1 mostly about?
   A. how pioneer children helped out at home
   B. when pioneer children went to school
   C. what summer and winter were like for pioneer children
   D. how schools sometimes didn't have a teacher

2. Why did children take books from home to school?
   A. They liked the books they had at home better than the ones at school.
   B. The families could only pay the schoolteachers by giving them books.
   C. The school didn't have enough books.
   D. The books were used over and over.

3. What is one clue that this text is nonfiction?
   A. It has headings.
   B. It tells a story about going to school.
   C. It has a title and an author.
   D. It has a setting and characters.

4. What is one way pioneer schools were like schools today?
   A. There was one teacher for all the grades.
   B. Students mostly memorized things.
   C. Students did experiments for science.
   D. Students learned math and reading.
5. Read the sentences from the passage.

“Children had **slates** that they used to write on. They could erase the work they did on the slates and use them over and over.”

Based on the description in the sentences, you can tell that **slates** were **most** like

A. large posters.
B. small chalkboards.
C. long books.
D. short pencils.

6. Which detail **best** supports the main idea that pioneer schools were mostly different from schools today?

A. Pioneer children went to school in winter.
B. Children enjoyed lunchtime.
C. Students also learned history.
D. One teacher taught children of all ages.

7. What is the main idea of paragraph 3?

A. Families were proud to own books.
B. Children used slates to write on.
C. Schools didn’t have many books and supplies.
D. Children took their own books to school.

8. When did pioneer children go to school?

A. in summer and winter
B. in spring and fall
C. in fall and winter
D. in winter and spring
Appendix E.D

Sample Mathematics Unit

Do Now!

Unit 1 Lesson 1

Comparing Whole Numbers

Name ___________________________ Class ___________________ Date ___________________

Amelia and Sean put base-10 pieces on place value mats. Whose number is greater?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>Hundreds</th>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>![Amelia's Thousands]</td>
<td>![Amelia's Hundreds]</td>
<td>![Amelia's Tens]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>![Sean's Thousands]</td>
<td>![Sean's Hundreds]</td>
<td>![Sean's Tens]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amelia's number is ___________.

Sean's number is ___________.

Do the mats have the same number of thousands cubes? _____

Do the mats have the same number of hundreds flats? _____

Do the mats have the same number of tens rods? _____

Which person's number has more tens? ___________.

Use the numbers above to complete the statement: _________ > _________.

___________ number is greater.

Compare each pair of numbers. Write >, <, or =.

1. 561 _______ 5,061
2. 4,285 _______ 4,199
3. 3,478 _______ 3,478
4. 7,204 _______ 7,202
The first-, second-, and third-graders collected cans to recycle. The place value chart shows the numbers of cans. Order the numbers of cans collected from least to greatest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>Hundreds</th>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare the thousands cubes.

Which grade has the fewest number of thousands cubes?  
The _______ grade collected the least number of cans.

Compare the hundreds flats of the remaining grades.

Which grade has the greater number of hundreds flats?  
The _______ grade collected the greatest number of cans.

The numbers of cans collected from least to greatest are ________, ________, and ________.

**Order from least to greatest.**

1. 6,124; 759; 3,088  
2. 5,628; 4,980; 5,402; 3,764
Do Now!

Unit 1 Lesson 3

Rounding Whole Numbers

Name ___________________ Class ___________________ Date __________

Andrew’s dog weighs 37 pounds. What is the weight of Andrew’s dog rounded to the nearest ten?

What ten is to the left of 37? _____
What ten is to the right of 37? _____
The number 37 is closer to which ten? _____
What is 37 pounds rounded to the nearest ten? _________

The weight of Andrew’s dog rounded to the nearest ten is _____ pounds.

Round 462 to the nearest hundred.
What digit is in the hundreds place? _____
What digit is to the right of the hundreds place? _____

Compare this digit to 5: _____ 5.
If this digit is greater than or equal to 5, round the hundreds digit up.
If this digit is less than 5, keep the hundreds digit the same.
Write zeros for all the digits to the right of the digit being rounded.
The number 462 rounded to the nearest hundred is _______.

Round each number to the nearest ten.

1 74

2 28

Round each number to the nearest hundred.

3 859

4 615

Grade 3 • Do Now! Math
Test-Taking Strategy:
Finding Key Vocabulary

Name __________________________ Class ______________ Date __________

Three friends are comparing their shell collections. Nina has 101 shells. Connor has 89 shells. Talia has 93 shells. Which list of numbers is in order from least to greatest?

a. 101; 93; 89  b. 93; 89; 101  c. 89; 93; 101  d. 101; 89; 93

1. **Find:** the list of numbers in order from least to greatest

2. **Strategy:** Find and underline key vocabulary words. Define the words.
   
   *least* – the number with the ________ value

   *greatest* – the number with the ________ value

3. **Solve:** Look at the place value chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hundreds</th>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which number is the least? _____ It has _____ hundreds and _____ tens.

Which number is the greatest? _____ It has _____ hundred and _____ tens.

The numbers from least to greatest are _____; _____; and _____.

4. **How did the Finding Key Vocabulary strategy help you solve the problem?**

Find key vocabulary words. Solve the problem.

1. On Thursday, 1,398 people attended a play. The attendance was 2,164 on Friday, 2,303 on Saturday, and 1,775 on Sunday. Which day had the greatest attendance?
   
   a. Thursday  b. Friday  c. Saturday  d. Sunday
Solve each problem. Choose the best answer.

1. At a weightlifting contest, the top four winners lifted 311 pounds, 276 pounds, 293 pounds, and 320 pounds. Which is the greatest number of pounds lifted?
   A  311 pounds
   B  276 pounds
   C  293 pounds
   D  320 pounds

2. Three schools have 182 students, 528 students, and 303 students. Which list of numbers is in order from least to greatest?
   A  528; 182; 303
   B  528; 303; 182
   C  182; 303; 528
   D  303; 182; 528

3. Paul has 947 sports cards and Alicia has 749 cards. Which statement shows that 947 is greater than 749?
   A  947 > 749
   B  749 > 947
   C  947 < 749
   D  749 = 947

4. Jesse is thinking about buying a new racing bike. The bikes he can buy cost $1,499, $1,379, $1,625, and $1,820. Which is the least number of dollars?
   A  $1,499
   B  $1,379
   C  $1,625
   D  $1,820

5. The heights of four mountains in Pennsylvania are 2,656 feet, 2,008 feet, 2,458 feet, and 3,213 feet. Order the numbers from greatest to least.
   A  2,008; 2,458; 2,656; 3,213
   B  3,213; 2,656; 2,458; 2,008
   C  2,656; 2,458; 3,213; 2,008
   D  2,458; 2,008; 2,656; 3,213

6. Fran read a book that is 327 pages long. Rounded to the nearest hundred, how many pages is Fran's book?
   A  300
   B  320
   C  330
   D  400
7. Sherise has 47 red beads, 34 green beads, 52 yellow beads, and 39 blue beads. Which color does she have the least of?
   A  red
   B  green
   C  yellow
   D  blue

8. Ricardo is trying to estimate the total number of seats in three sections of a stadium. Which number shows how he should round the number 268 to the nearest hundred?
   A  240
   B  200
   C  250
   D  300

9. Four friends count the number of crayons they have in their crayon boxes. Mike has 91 crayons, DeShawn has 87, Ann has 95, and Penny has 84. Who has the greatest number of crayons?
   A  Mike
   B  DeShawn
   C  Ann
   D  Penny

10. In week 1, there were 395 fans at the school football game. In week 2, there were 435 fans. In week 3, there were 418 fans. Which list shows the number of fans in order from least to greatest?
    A  395; 418; 435
    B  435; 395; 418
    C  418; 395; 435
    D  395; 435; 418

11. Kim is rounding the number of apples in a large basket to the nearest ten. What is the greatest whole number that rounds to 70?
    A  65
    B  69
    C  74
    D  75

12. The weight of a mako shark was measured on a special scale. Rounded to the nearest hundred, its weight was 500 pounds. What is the least whole number that rounds to 500?
    A  450
    B  451
    C  549
    D  550
Appendix F

COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT MODEL

My EPP focuses on the development of a support model for high need schools. The Comprehensive Assessment Model was included as an artifact because the appropriate and effective use of data is pivotal to the success of the support model. To establish an effective learning environment teachers must know the following: how to identify students in need, collect information to support the development of academic planning for struggling students, monitor the progress of the struggling students and assess the effectiveness of the support provided. The implementation of Comprehensive Assessment Model within the high need schools will assist in improving the learning environment, the instructional delivery of teachers and student academic outcomes.

School Description

Stephen Girard is a K-4 elementary school in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). It is located in the South Region of the SDP at 1800 Snyder Avenue. The current enrollment is 547 students and is representative of the diverse population within the community: The student population is 65.4% African American, 20.8 Asian, 6.2% White, 4.8% Latino, and 2.7% Other. The percent of students receiving free and reduced-price
lunch is 81.9%, which is 7.5% higher than the citywide participation of 74.4%. The percent of students receiving Special Education services is 10.2%, .5% of the students are classified as Mentally Gifted and 18.6% of the students are classified as English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). The average daily attendance of the school is 91.3%. The average daily attendance of the teachers is 83.5%, which is 10.5% lower than the district average of 94%.

The teaching staff of Girard has a 100% rate of highly qualified teachers according to NCLB standards. The table below illustrates the number of years experience among the teaching staff.

Table 15

*Teaching Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current principal has been the lead administrator for four years and has added an assistant principal to the administrative team with a strong curricular and professional development background.
Curriculum

The SDP has a mandated Core Curriculum and Planning Schedule Timeline (PST). The Core Curriculum provides the framework, resource materials, and strategies for daily instruction within a particular content area. The PST provides teachers with the instructional focus, specified content, and pace of the daily instruction. In addition, the district also provides an approved supplemental material and intervention list for each content area.

Girard is a school-wide Title 1 School that transitioned to the Harcourt reading series Story Town for its K-3 students at the beginning of the 2008 school year. Prior to the 2008 school year, Girard used the Voyager reading series because they were involved with a grant. At the conclusion of the grant the decision was made to transition all Voyager schools to Story Town. Story Town was implemented in all Reading First Schools, approximately 55 schools, in 2007. Girard uses a reading block which is ninety minutes long five days a week. The reading block is structured with specific components which are:

- Shared Reading
- Guided Reading
- Read Aloud
- Writing
Achievement

The large scale assessment for the state of Pennsylvania is the PSSA. The PSSA tests grades 3-8 and 11 in Reading and Mathematics; grades 4, 8, and 11 in Science; and grades 5, 8, and 11 in Writing. Reading and Mathematics scores are used to determine if schools have made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The current targets for Reading and Mathematics are 63% and 56% proficient respectively. Girard did not make AYP, so their current AYP status is Warning. They met 15 of 23 targets overall, but only met 1 of the 5 academic targets in Reading. Table 2 outlines the percent of proficient students on the PSSA overall and for each student group in Reading and the change from the previous year.

Table 16

*AYP Performance of Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Change from Last Year</th>
<th>Met Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Overall</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>-11.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>-14.1</td>
<td>Yes (CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP-Special Education</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of proficient students has declined dramatically in Reading. Each group declined by at least 7% and the only group that improved its performance is the IEP-
Special Education student group by 4.5%. This is reinforced by the percentage of Girard students who are below basic when comparing them to the district and the state. In 2008 44% of the third grade students were below basic in Reading on the PSSA as compared to 30% for the district and 12% for the state. Almost one-third (32%) of the third grades students were proficient in Reading on the PSSA as compared to 45% for the district and 57% for the state. When a third of the student population performs at a below basic level it is clear that the instructional practices are not successful and an in depth assessment of the learning process is needed.

The Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System (PVAAS) measures growth and can predict performance for schools and individual students. PVAAS is used in grades 4-8 and 11. The Value Added Reading Report for Girard indicated its estimated School Mean NCE Gain is -1.4, which means the fourth grade student population actually declined in achievement. Their Performance Diagnostic Reading Report showed a decline for students in the following performance categories: below basic -1.4, proficient -1.3, advanced -5.0. Basic is the only performance category that fourth grade students showed growth, 2.2, Girard’s Reading Projection Summary report states 19% of the current fourth grade students have a greater than or equal to 70% probability of proficiency, 23% have a 40% to 70% probability of proficiency, and 58% have a less than or equal to 40% probability of proficiency.

DIBELS is a K-3 screening assessment that estimates levels of risk in reading skills. The information is reported in three categories: benchmark (low level of risk),
strategic (moderate level of risk), and intensive (high level of risk). DIBELS data for Girard over the past three years shows a considerable decline in the percentage of students at benchmark when comparing the 2005 kindergarten class to the 2008 third grade class. In 2005 the kindergarten class yielded the following: 50.3% at benchmark, 23.48% strategic, and 20% Intensive. In 2008 the third grade class yielded the following: 25.69% at benchmark, 22.94% strategic and 23.85% intensive. Although this was not a true longitudinal comparison, it still illustrates that students are not progressing at an effective rate that indicates their readiness to be proficient readers. Table 3 outlines the DIBELS results for the 2005 Kindergarten class and the 2008 third grade class.

Table 17
DIBELS Performance of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Intensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>-24.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Support System**

The SDP has a new Superintendent and is currently under a massive reorganization to align with the mission and vision of the current leadership. Offices are being reorganized and new responsibilities and initiatives are being formed. As they are developed and implemented they will clearly define the particular services and supports
available to schools at various levels. Stephen Girard’s organizational structure consists of a Principal, an Assistant Principal, grade-level leaders, and content-area leaders. Their immediate line of support is through the Regional Office, which can provide operational and academic support. They can also receive operational and academic support from the various offices within central Administration depending upon their need. Girard receives professional development through district-led initiatives with the opportunity for intermittent differentiation based on need. There are 11 days for half or full-day professional development. On half days the school has the autonomy to plan and on full days the district provides the professional development. The Office of Professional Development is in the process of creating the professional development plan for the district.

Prior to 2007-2008 Stephen Girard has had some level of academic success, but not at the necessary pace to meet NCLB standards. Its academic performance has been statistically flat for several years, meeting AYP, but by some provision. The most recent performance indicates the school is in need of some instructional focus, retooling, and monitoring. The school has several positives such as the stability of the staff, principal, addition of an assistant principal, which will be beneficial in the school “righting the ship”.

**General Concern**

The School District of Philadelphia has a professional development system called PD Planner, which is a web-based Professional Development Management System. The system supports easy record-keeping, tracking, and reporting of the many components of
schools’ and districts’ professional development programs. The system supports individuals, mentors, school administrators, district administrators, and activity facilitators. Employees can establish professional development goals and monitor their own progress. It is an expansive system that offers a multitude of resources and support for staff. Although there is a vast amount of professional development available, it is not differentiated, sustained and attendance is not mandatory for a significant amount of the supports being offered. Teachers are trained in how to administer assessments, but the availability of training to develop action steps related to the results of the assessment is limited. The district has done a good job at getting teachers to become familiar with assessments and data, but too often they are not sure what to do as a result of the assessment.

**Specific Concern**

Assessment has become a part of school culture. Teachers, schools, and districts are expected to provide insight into students’ abilities and performance, and to plan a prescribed course of action on a regular basis. It is essential to have valid and reliable assessments to support the learning process. Torgesen (2006) discusses how critical it is to have a comprehensive assessment plan. He identified four main objectives for an early grade comprehensive assessment plan:

1. To **identify** students at the beginning of the year who are “at risk” for reading difficulties and who may need extra instruction or intensive interventions if they are to progress toward grade-level standards in reading by the end of the year.
2. To **monitor** students’ progress during the year to determine whether “at risk” students are making adequate progress in critical reading skills and to identify any students who may be falling behind.

3. To **collect** information about students that will be helpful in planning instruction to meet their most critical learning needs.

4. To **assess** whether the instruction provided by classroom teachers and intervention specialists is sufficiently powerful to help all students achieve grade-level reading standards by the end of each year from kindergarten through third grade.

The four objectives of Torgesen’s Comprehensive Assessment Plan provide an outline for an assessment system, but there is still a pivotal piece schools must provide. Teachers must participate in professional development that provides them with the necessary tools to make data-driven decisions. Without that there is a tendency to make “cardiac assessments,” which are instructional decisions based on feelings and not on data. When this occurs, teachers are off-task instructionally because the identified area(s) of focus and support were not chosen through an effective protocol. A lack of instructional focus will impact performance and limit growth of the student population. Torgesen, Houston, Rissman, & Kosanovich (2007) discussed the need to ensure teachers have excellent, ongoing, professional development identifying it as a critical task when providing literacy leadership. They list it as the first task a principal must implement to sustain an effective reading program. Strong professional development exposes teachers to new teaching approaches, creates opportunities for practice within the classroom, and provides a venue for discussion regarding implementation and effectiveness.
**Target Population**

This plan concentrates on the entire student body of Stephen Girard. Girard is a K-4 Elementary school with students ranging from the age of 5-10 years old. I will work with the entire teaching staff, which consists of four kindergarten, two first grade, two second grade, five third grade, four fourth grade teachers, two special education teachers, and one ELL teacher. They range in experience from 3 to 25 years.

**Clear Description of Current Practice**

The School District of Philadelphia has a clear assessment policy for its schools. DIBELS is administered to students in grades K-3 for Reading First schools. Non-Reading First schools administer it to grades K-1. This will be the last year of Reading First in the district, so this may change. DIBELS is administered 3 times a year. All teachers in grades K-3 administer DRA once during each marking period. Gates is administered by all teachers in grades 4-8 once during each marking period. Wrap Reading Test is administered by teachers in grades 4-8 when a student’s outcome on Gates is not on level. All schools also participate in benchmarks in grades 3-12. The benchmarks are provided by Kaplan and are administered 4 times a year. The instructional cycle is six weeks and the benchmark assesses student’s mastery of what was previously taught during the cycle. The district is in the process of implementing a new assessment for its tutoring program. The assessment is being provided by CTB and it is called Acuity. It will be administered to students who are categorized as below proficiency according to NCLB standards. The tutoring program is for students in grades...
3-11. Due to the size of the district and the funding available a percentage of students within the identified population in each grade at each school will participate. The assessment will be a predicative assessment for the PSSA. This is also an audition for Acuity because there has been a desire to have one benchmark tool. Acuity may become the benchmark assessment for the entire district. The table below outlines the Kindergarten through eighth grade literacy assessments.

Table 18

*K-8 Literacy Assessments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Grades Tested</th>
<th>Area of Performance Assessed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type (screening, progress monitor, etc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS K-3</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>o Phonological awareness</td>
<td>3x per year</td>
<td>Screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Alphabetic principle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Fluency with connected text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.R.A.P. 4-8</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>o Decoding and Comprehension</td>
<td>Ongoing/administered as needed</td>
<td>Screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA K-3</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>o Reading development</td>
<td>Ongoing/ at least 2x per year</td>
<td>Screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates-MacGinitie</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>o Vocabulary and comprehension</td>
<td>Beginning and end of year</td>
<td>screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP benchmark K-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Core content areas</td>
<td>3x per year</td>
<td>Progress monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Clear Description of Goal for Change**

Data driven decision making is a process with many phases. It requires an understanding of assessment, the ability to analyze the data, understand its implications, and design a course of action to support strengths or areas of concern. When teachers have a better understanding of the data, it makes it easier to identify the “what” and the “how” in the learning process. When teachers can identify the “what” and the “how” it is safe to assume that they are increasing the probability of effective instruction, which means higher student achievement.

Girard has grade and teacher leaders, but their role and responsibilities are not clearly defined concerning student achievement. In addition, their skills are not being cultivated to be an instructional support to the school. Mangin and Stoelinga (2008) describe “loose coupling” as schools engaging in a variety of instructional tasks which the actors in the school are uncertain how to complete. This is why having access to and participating in sustained quality professional development is so critical. Too often schools and teachers find themselves in a position where they are not clear on how to complete a task because the training was not aligned. My plan will focus on teaching teachers to use the results of the assessments to plan instruction and developing grade leaders to be instructional coaches within the building.
Teachers have to make numerous decisions on a daily basis about what they are going to teach and how. When making those decisions they have a tendency to use “cardiac assessment” to make a decision, basing their actions on a feeling. Data should drive the instructional decision making process in the classroom. This is sometimes difficult to accomplish because we spend a great deal of time in professional development talking about the assessment, but very little time talking about what to do as a result of the assessment. This is caused by the lack of a clear systemic process to assist teachers in the decision making process. The cognitive model provides the framework and process to assist teachers in the instructional decision making process. It will be the focal point of the professional development the staff of Girard will receive.

Another critical component to the instructional decision making process is the instructional support and services teachers receive. The grade leaders’ role is to provide instructional direction and support to the staff within the building. However, they are not put in positions to be viewed as instructional support. They spend most of their time focusing on clerical tasks. This plan will refocus the role of the grade leader, reinserting them back into the role of instructional support.

**Research Basis for Selecting the Change**

The reason I chose to focus on the teacher and grade leaders is they are an extension of the administration within the building. The administration will use them to assist in the support of the teaching staff within the school. In that role it is essential that
they are viewed as an instructional resource by the staff. Torgesen et al (2007) identified three program elements that are critical to reading instruction:

1. Consistently implemented, high quality initial classroom instruction and follow-up small-group instruction that is well differentiated according to student needs

2. Use of student performance data to guide instruction and allocate resources

3. Resources to provide instruction for struggling readers

The teacher and grade leader will play an integral role in those elements being implemented with fidelity. They will be expected to provide support to a teacher who is struggling to implement instruction at a high level. They will also be expected to explain student performance data, assist in the development of a plan, and provide recommendations for struggling learners. The development of the respective roles is essential to the overall success of the school. In 2008, Garet tested the effectiveness of two professional development interventions in improving the knowledge and practice of teachers and the reading achievement of their students in high poverty schools using an experimental design. The findings of the study support the fact that quality sustained professional development increases teacher knowledge. One can believe with a deeper understanding of a content it will have a positive impact on student achievement.

Assessments of Student Learning

NCLB defines a student group as a homogeneous group of forty or more students. The categorizing of students begins in grade three and concludes at the highest grade
within the respective school. All students are represented in the Students Overall group. Students are also placed into every NCLB student group in which they meet the criterion. Stephen Girard is a K-4 school and has a total of four student groups. The student groups are Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, IEP-Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged. I will focus on the entire student population of Stephen Girard through the following scope:

- NCLB assessed grades
- DIBELS assessed grades

Table 2 above shows the percentage of students who are proficient in reading has decreased severely, 11.6% from the previous school year. Almost two-thirds (64.5%) of the students are not proficient in Reading at Stephen Girard and that is unacceptable. Table 3 shows the percentage of students who are at benchmark decreased considerably when comparing kindergarten students in 2005 to third grade students in 2008. Almost one-fourth (24.6%) of students who were considered to be at benchmark in kindergarten are not in third grade. In both instances the data shows that Reading is not being delivered at a high level of fidelity within the school. The underlying cause for the lack of fidelity is the lack of a coherent and consistent process to make data-driven instructional decision.

**Screening**

A screening assessment is an initial process to identify potential areas where a student may have difficulty. The two assessments I will use for screenings are the PSSA
and DIBELS. I will use the PSSA to identify the needs of grades three and four. The PSSA is administered annually and assesses students in Reading and Mathematics. I will focus on the Reading component of the PSSA. The PSSA assesses student’s ability to demonstrate proficiency on the Pennsylvania standards at their grade level. The test is constructed from eligible content, which is grade specific. Eligible content is the core of the standard and anchors. It represents what the state has identified as potential competencies for students which can be measured at each grade level. The reading component of the PSSA has two reporting categories. The reporting categories are:

A  Comprehension and Reading Skills
   A.1 Understand fiction appropriate to grade level
   A.2 Understanding nonfiction appropriate to grade level

B  Interpretation and Analysis of Fictional and Non-Fictional text
   B.1 Understand components within and between texts
   B.3 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text

I will collect PSSA data from the Pennsylvania District Report and from eMetric. The data will be summarized by grade and reporting category. The table below illustrates the format.
I will use DIBELS to screen in grades kindergarten through second. DIBELS are a set of standardized, individually administered measures of early literacy development. They are administered at least three times a year and they are designed to be one minute fluency measures used to regularly monitor the development of pre-reading and early reading skills. DIBELS was designed to measure three of the five big ideas of early reading and comprehension skills.

### Table 19

**PSSA Data Summary Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Comprehension and Reading Skills</th>
<th>Interpretation and Analysis of fiction and Non Fiction text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehension and Reading Skills Interpretation and Analysis of fiction and Non Fiction text
literacy: Phonological Awareness, Alphabetic Principal, and Fluency with Connected Text. Each of the measures is described briefly below:

**Measures of Phonological Awareness**

- **Initial Sound Fluency (ISF):** Assesses a child’s skill to identify and produce the initial sound of a given word.

- **Phonemic Segmentation Fluency (PSF):** Assesses a child’s skill to produce the individual sounds within a given word.

**Measure of Alphabetic Principal**

- **Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF):** Assesses a child’s knowledge of letter sound correspondence as well as their ability to blend letters together to form unfamiliar “nonsense” words.

**Measure of Fluency with Connected Text:**

- **Oral Reading Fluency (ORF):** Assesses a child’s skill of reading connected text in grade-level material.

I will collect data from the DIBELS website and the data will be summarized by grade, date of screening, level, and progress over time. The table below illustrates the format.

Table 20

*DIBELS Data Summary Template*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIBELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagnostic

A diagnostic assessment is an in-depth process to identify special needs or areas where a student may have difficulty. If the results of the screening determine additional assessment is needed, I will use the Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA). The ERDA is an individually administered diagnostic test to identify young children at risk for reading difficulty or failure. The assessment provides specific information about a child’s reading skills to help develop targeted, grade specific instruction. This assessment should be administered to strategic and intensive students. The student performance is reported within a student profile, with skills analysis and qualitative data to assist teachers in developing a comprehensive intervention plan.

I will use the DRA as a diagnostic assessment in kindergarten through third grade. DRA is a standardized system of benchmark running records used to assess reading development in kindergarten to third grade. It is administered at least two times a year and is conducted during one-to-one reading conferences as children read specially leveled texts. The DRA is used for the following two reasons:

- To provide instructional information so teachers know what kind of instruction will accelerate a student’s reading ability
- To document and report progress in reading levels and in the ability to use specific skills and strategies

The data will be collected and summarized by grade, performance, and area of need. The table below illustrates the format.
### Developmental Reading Data Summary Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Area of Need</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Progress Monitoring

I will use two assessments in grades three and four. The first is the SDP Benchmark test, which is administered to all students three times a year. Benchmark are low-stakes interim tests aligned to the PA standards via the Planning and Schedule Timeline of the core curriculum. It consists of 15-25 multiple choice items only. The assessment determines the knowledge and skills that students have acquired every five weeks of the six week cycle for grades three through eight. I will collect data form Schoolnet and it will be summarized by grade, performance, and standard. The second is Acuity. Acuity is a formative assessment provided by CTB McGraw-Hill. Those students in grades three and four who are not proficient according to NCLB standards and the PSSA will be administered Acuity three times during the school year. The district will be using the predicative assessment within Acuity, which measures how a student may perform on the state assessment. It is aligned to the state standards and simulates the PSSA in format and weighted areas. It will consist of a minimum of thirty five multiple choice items.
choice questions and two open-ended. I will collect data from the Acuity website. The data will be summarized by grade, performance, and reporting category.

Based on the results of the assessments, each grade will develop an action plan. The action plan will identify and outline the instructional strategies, practices, and implementation needed to have a positive impact on the immediate area of need and daily instruction. Each teacher will tailor the implementation of the action plan to meet the specific needs of their students. The plan will be monitored daily and revisited every thirty days. Acceptable evidence to measure effectiveness of the intervention will be identified within the plan. Data will be collected weekly on the deliverables within the action plan by the leadership team and documented on the progress monitoring form. Every 30 days the action plan will be revisited to determine whether it has been implemented, partially implemented, not implemented.

**Outcome**

The PSSA will be used in grades three and four and DIBELS will be used in kindergarten through second grade to evaluate the effectiveness of the action plan. The goal for the PSSA is to increase proficiency by at least 10% overall and in every student group. The data will be collected via PAAYP.com and summarized by the overall school and its student groups. The goal for DIBELS is to increase the number of benchmark students by at least 10% by the third administration. The data will be collected via the DIBELS website and summarized by grade and level.
The teachers within Stephen Girard work hard and take the education of their children seriously. The decline in performance has been disappointing for them as a school. Having had an opportunity to visit the school it is clear the issue is not commitment, but focus and implementation. There is a lack of consistent targeted instructional focus and the implementation is not to the necessary depth and breadth to maximize student achievement. Being engaged in sustained professional development and creating a process to assess teaching and learning within the school will help them move in the right direction.

Reform Strategy

Effective Instruction

Grade group meetings will be the forum I will use to monitor and discuss the assessment plan that will be implemented at Stephen Girard. Girard conducts weekly grade group meetings. Grade group meetings are a forum where teachers within the same grade come together to discuss teaching and learning. The framework of the discussion is:

- Current instructional practice and strategies within the classroom,
- Evidence of effectiveness,
- Progress monitoring,
- Next steps.

The grade group meeting is facilitated by the teacher leader and administration is in attendance. In order for the grade group to be effective it is critical that all participants
adhere to the framework. The focus must solely be on instruction and the teacher leader must keep all participants on task. During the meeting teachers will discuss their experiences during teaching highlighting what was effective and an area that is in need of support. The teacher leader will provide them with the necessary support by synthesizing the feedback to determine next steps and model what it should look like.

Research Evidence

Alberta Initiative for School Improvement (AISI) (2001-2003) conducted a research review to provide information to Alberta K-12 educators on the opportunity to cultivate and embed more elaborate forums for teacher professional development. The study had six key findings, but the two I felt were most relevant were:

- Collaboration and knowledge sharing: The success of a project depended on how effectively information was shared
- The importance of time: Projects seeking to embed collaborative professional development practices recognize that a fundamental shift in thinking about teaching and learning was required. Positive change takes time

This study emphasized the importance of effective communication and time in the success of school improvement, which will be two critical elements as teacher leaders try to build capacity in grade group meeting concerning data driven decision making.

CRESPAR (1997) examined how performance-based assessment fit into the performance-based movement. Their work showed that teachers are ready and able to learn about alternative assessments. Teacher development workshops can be designed by school systems in collaboration with university partners and teachers to help teachers
incorporate these assessments into their performance-based instruction and curriculum. This study emphasized the need for teachers to understand the multiple forms of assessment to measure learning and the need to incorporate into daily instruction.

**Implementation description**

The data-driven decision-making process that will be implemented at Girard will consist of the following elements:

- **Identification of the assessment**
  - The school will administer the assessments identified by the district at the appropriate time

- **Purpose and potential outcomes of the assessment**
  - Teachers will receive professional development regarding the purpose and potential outcomes of the assessment

- **Root cause analysis**
  - Teachers will use the cognitive model to determine area of deficiency

- **Identification of targeted instructional strategy and or intervention**
  - Based on the cognitive model teachers will identify potential intervention needs using the following format:
    - PA and word recognition
    - Word recognition and fluency
    - Fluency and comprehension
    - Comprehension and vocabulary

- **Monitoring tool and benchmark**
The Grade group meeting will be utilized as forum to monitor progress.

The agenda will contain the following elements:

- Instructional Planning
- Progress monitoring
- Teaching with fidelity
- Evidence of effectiveness
  - Appropriate evidence and artifacts will be identified to assist with the evaluation of effectiveness of the identified strategy and or intervention

Teachers will use the following form to monitor progress of the students.

Figure 1

*Literacy progress monitoring template*
Professional Support Plan

Theory Building

Staff members at Stephen Girard have participated in ongoing training regarding administering the various literacy assessments pertaining to grades K through 8. However, they have not been exposed to any training that focuses on the process after the assessments are administered and the results are analyzed. Therefore, the teachers in kindergarten through fourth grade and the Literacy Teacher Leader will participate in professional development that will cover the entire school year. The format will include an initial week during the month of August and seven additional sessions to occur every six weeks beginning in October. The professional development will be facilitated by the Office of Assessment and The Office of Teaching and Learning. The professional development will consist of three parts, which are

- Understanding the purpose of the literacy assessments
- Understanding the cognitive model: Identifying instructional supports and strategies to enhance student learning
- Developing an effective progress monitoring system

The framework of the professional development will consist of theory and practice. The initial week will be divided into two sessions per day. The participants will receive the theory on each topic area during the first session and participants will put into practice what they learned during the second session. The table below illustrates the framework for the professional development.
Table 22

*Professional Development Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Day 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The topic for day one professional development is: *Understanding the purpose of the literacy assessments*. The Office of Assessment will clarify the purpose of the literacy assessments given, the type of results to expect, and the appropriate way to use the results of the assessment. It will also provide a better understanding of the difference and purpose of screenings and diagnostics. Lastly, teachers will be provided with a step-by-step guide that outlines the next steps after the assessment.

The second topic, *Understanding the cognitive model: identifying instructional supports and strategies to enhance student learning*, will be covered on days two and three. The Office of Teaching and Learning will clarify the characteristics of strong and/or deficient word recognition, fluency, and comprehension skills. Teachers will be provided with various examples of what it looks like in the classroom during learning. They will also be provided with research on effective strategies and supports to address the areas of word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. Lastly, teachers will receive a chart that outlines the strategies that support each area respectively, the target audience, and evidence of effectiveness.
The final topic, *Developing an effective progress monitoring system*, will be covered on days four and five. The Office of Assessment and the Office of Teaching and Learning will co-facilitate. The Office of Assessment will review setting appropriate goals and benchmarks. It will also review the identification, implementation, and collection of data related to informal assessments in the classroom and provide teachers with a chart outlining the steps and guidelines of effective use of informal assessments in the classroom. The Office of Teaching and Learning will review differentiated instruction, including a clear definition of what differentiated instruction is as well as tiered lessons in the area of word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. The Office of Teaching and Learning will also provide a framework that outlines the set-up of differentiated classroom and the steps of implementation.

**Demonstration**

During the first phase of the professional development teachers were exposed to theory in the three topic areas. During the second phase of the training they will get hands-on experience.

During the second phase of Day one, the Office of Assessment will walk teachers through a model using student data demonstrating the process teachers should use to understand it. Staff will model for teachers what to do when a student is on “benchmark,” “strategic,” or “intensive.” Teachers will be provided with scenarios that include sample data, recommendations, and courses of action taken by teachers. The expectation of the exercise is to have them determine whether the right decisions were made based on the
outcome of the assessment. Lastly, staff will work with teachers with their own classroom data to categorize their students in preparation for the second phase of the second training.

During the second phase of day two and three, the Office of Teaching and Learning will model for teachers the process teachers should take once the area of need has been identified. Staff will model for teachers how to identify the appropriate strategies in the areas of word recognition, fluency, and comprehension, how to effectively plan their lesson, and how to set up their classroom for tiered learning. Lastly, staff will work with teachers to identify the actual strategy for each respective area for the students in their classroom in preparation for the second phase of the third training.

During the second phase of day four and five using sample student data, the Office of Assessment will model how to set appropriate individual goals and benchmarks based on student results. Staff will model how to collect, analyze, and report data. Lastly, staff would walk teachers through the process of developing a progress monitoring tool for each strategy identified. The Office of Teaching and Learning will model tiered lessons in word recognition, fluency, and comprehension demonstrating for teachers what the lesson would look like and how they would interact. Staff will assist teachers in developing one week of lessons for their classroom in the respective areas using the identified strategies.
Practice

After completing the week of professional development the teachers will meet with teacher leaders to discuss the monitoring plan at the school level. The teacher leaders will review rubrics and checklists that will be used to monitor and evaluate effectiveness. Teachers will have two weeks to practice the tools within their classroom. During the two weeks teachers will meet in grade group to discuss strengths, areas of concern, and next steps regarding the tools. They will also develop one week of lessons. Teacher leaders will provide in classroom support and modeling. Teacher leaders will also identify classrooms within the building that are successfully implementing the tools for teachers to visit.

Feedback

The teacher leader will visit every class at least once a week. The purpose of the visit is to provide coaching on the implementation of the strategies or monitor the implementation of the strategy. Teacher leaders will leave a copy of the checklist with every teacher after each visit. The teacher leader will create a trend report identifying the areas of strength and areas of improvement based on the coaching and monitoring of the implementation of the strategies to share during grade group. Based on the trends teachers, with the support of the teacher leader, will identify next steps and a plan of implementation for the upcoming week. Every six weeks teachers will review anecdotal notes on their students to determine if progress has been made and if benchmarks have been met.
Reflection

The trend reports generated by the teacher leader will serve as a tool to shape the focus of professional development during grade group. It will give the teacher leader an opportunity to see whether the training and coaching to implement the identified strategies was effective. In addition, the grade group meetings provide a forum where reflection is essential to learning. Teachers are engaged in a reciprocal process that requires them to implement a strategy during daily instruction and bring artifacts to the next meeting to discuss implementation and effectiveness. The conversation provides an opportunity for teacher leaders to gain further insight on what teachers fully understand and what they may need additional support and development in.

Teacher leaders will continue to receive professional development from the Office of Assessment and the Office of Teaching and Learning on a monthly basis using the train the trainer model. The teacher leader will turn around the professional development for the staff at Girard every six weeks. The same process will be followed allowing time for practice and demonstration.

School reform is a difficult and daunting task. As educators we all can state what needs to be done to “fix” the problem. School reform can be compared to losing weight. If the question was posed whether or not you know what to do to lose ten pounds the answer would be yes. The next statement would be, then why are you not doing it? We may not what needs to be done to lose ten pounds, but we are not clear on the “how.” School reform is no different. We have a lot of possible solutions, but we are not very clear on the application. Both issues require a clear and systemic plan that involves all
stakeholders; training and monitoring is critical to the outcome. What derails any kind of reform effort, whether it is losing weight or school reform, is the inconsistent implementation and the lack of monitoring. This plan provides Girard with the model to be successful in their effort to raise student achievement.
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Appendix G

ACADEMIC SUPPORT TEAM

Overview

Description

The Academic Support Teams (AST) was school support teams that monitored the academic model of Empowerment Schools by conducting walkthroughs within the schools. The information collected by the teams was used to determine the level of program specific support and resources needed at the school.

Purpose

The purpose of the AST was to conduct instructional walkthroughs within the Empowerment Schools. The focus was on the core and supplemental instructional initiatives of the model. A walkthrough is designed to provide principals and other instructional leaders with at-a-glance information about what is working and not working in their school, and strategies to address and support instructional needs within the school. The AST collected data related to fidelity of implementation, instructional
strengths and weaknesses, and developed a course of action to support the area(s) of need.

**Development**

Why It Was Created

The School District of Philadelphia (SDP) did not have a formalized process to monitor and support the academic programs within its schools. The SDP conducted walkthroughs within their schools, but they were informally done, often in isolation to anything else happening at the school. The AST was developed for three reasons. The first was to assure there was a comprehensive, systemic and unified model that focused on the support and monitoring of the academic program within Empowerment Schools from central office. The second reason was to assist in the continued development of common language and understanding regarding the expected academic model and instructional expectations for Empowerment Schools. The third reason was to provide Empowerment Schools with a clear line of communication in reference to deliverables and support.

**Design Process**

The design process of the AST consisted of three components: identification of team members, procedures and reporting. Identifying the right team members would be critical to the success of the AST. I thought it would be important to match team members based on their expertise and the needs of the school as well as taking into account the personalities of people to make sure it is a good fit. Since the focus was
academics I would use the members of the Chief Academic Office (CAO) to develop the
teams. The CAO consisted of 13 offices, representing every phase of academics and
accountability. Based on the data of the Empowerment Schools I determined each team
would have at least three CAO members because I wanted a person with expertise in
mathematics, reading, special education on each team. I also added a fourth member,
ELL, to some teams because of the student population. Prior to finalizing the CAO
members for each team, I set up meeting with each department head. The purpose of
theses meeting was for me to be able to provide each department head with an overview
of what the AST function would be and how the CAO would be leading the effort. I also
wanted to get a better understanding of their staff work style, habits and relationships to
assist in the configuration of the AST. The principal and the School Based Instructional
Specialist (SBIS) of the school were also expected to participate in the walkthrough,
which brought the average size of a team to five.

The primary focus of the walkthrough was the core and intervention instructional
initiatives in the reading and mathematics of the Empowerment Model. Table 1 outlines
the core and instructional initiatives of the Empowerment Schools.

**Professional Development**

For the AST to be successful I thought it was important to develop and provide
focused and sustainable professional development. I developed a professional
development plan that provided an overview of the process, roles and responsibilities of
the AST and focused on the instructional programs being used within Empowerment
Schools. The initial professional development outlined the purpose for the teams, how the
teams were developed, the protocols and procedures associated with the process and the
overall expectations for the team and its members.

The content specific professional development for the AST members was
provided by the national consultants from the respective instructional programs being
used within the schools. Prior to the delivery of the professional development I held a
meeting with each company to provide them with an overview of the AST and to outline
the desired professional development I wanted to be delivered. I thought it was important
for them to understand the professional development should not only focus on providing
an overview of the program, but it was just as critical for them to focus on how you
appropriately and effectively support and monitor the program. Table 1 outlines all of the
K-8 academic programs used with the Empowerment Schools.

Table 23
Empowerment Schools Core and Intervention Initiatives for K-8 and Middle Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-8</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine It!</td>
<td>Glencoe Literature</td>
<td>Corrective Reading (4-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday Mathematics (K-5)</td>
<td>Prentice Hall Math</td>
<td>Corrective Mathematics (4-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall Math (6-8)</td>
<td>Prentice Hall Math (6-8)</td>
<td>Read to Achieve (7-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jr. Great Books (K-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Round Table (6-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Mastery (K-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connected Mathematics (K-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each company provided me with the professional development they were going to deliver
and I reviewed it to make sure it was in alignment with our messaging and expectations.
The aforementioned professional development was provided to AST members prior to the walkthroughs beginning. Once the walkthroughs began, professional development was held once a month to review programmatic expectations, walkthrough procedures and practices.

**Process**

Walkthroughs were conducted by the AST on a bi-weekly basis in elementary and middle schools. The primary “look for(s)” of the walkthrough were based on each specific program and targeted the learning environment, fidelity of implementation as it relates to instructional initiatives, delivery and effectiveness of instruction, and evidence of student learning.

The walkthrough was expected to be completed within a 2 hour time frame. The walkthrough consisted of five components: initial debriefing, classroom visits, analyzing and synthesizing evidence, report of findings and development of a support plan (30 minutes). The initial debriefing was a preliminary meeting between the AST and the school leadership to discuss the specific focus of the walkthrough, review visitation schedule, determine additional “look fors” from the school leadership and identify visitation partners. Based on the developed schedule each team would visit their respective classes using the prescribed tool for the content visited. At the conclusion of the each classroom visited and instructional initiative observed they coded it to identify areas of need and positive models for growth and development. The following format was used to code each classroom and instructional initiative:
Green - Proficient

Yellow – Near Proficiency

Red – Not Proficient

To make the process of collecting and storing data more efficient with the ability to identify trends within and across all Empowerment Schools the SDP entered into a partnership with Teachscape, which is a school effectiveness company that provides online multimedia resources and designs professional learning experiences to raise the instructional level of teachers and student achievement. Classroom walkthrough is a resource that focuses on the approach of collecting classroom observation data. Classroom Walkthrough technology is a simple data collection application that can be added to most wireless handheld devices (e.g. iPad, iPhone, Palm, Blackberry, Windows Mobile devices). Once uploaded, the data are shaped into reports, graphs, and eventually insight, creating the opportunity to examine the data, work towards a shared goal of improving instruction and boosting student achievement. It also allows for areas of strength and needed growth to be quickly identified to inform professional development practices.

After visiting all of their classes, each team was expected to analyze and synthesize its findings, creating one response for each class visited and program observed. After all classes were visited and each team has analyzed and synthesized its visits, the group reconvened and each team reported its findings to the whole group. The findings of the group were recorded and trends were identified. Based on the trends, areas of development and areas of strength were identified and a plan of support and continued
developed was created. Appendixes A through A-3 are samples of the walkthrough tools for the instructional programs.

The AST provided a report to the principal within 24 hours outlining the area(s) of focus, the number of classroom visited, status of classrooms visited, status of instructional initiatives, areas of development and strength, course of action to support areas of strength and development and the person responsible to provide the prescribed support (school based and central office). Appendix B is a sample of the report template used to provide written feedback.
Appendix G.A

Ten-Minute Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Unit/Lesson #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sound/Spelling Cards (Alphabet Sound Cards in K)**
- [ ] Displayed in a prominent place and kept up all year long. Ideally displayed low enough for students to point to, but high enough for all students to easily see and readily access as a reference
- [ ] Kindergarten: Cards have picture side facing wall until formally introduced (beginning Unit 3 Lesson 1)
- [ ] Grade One: Cards have picture side facing the wall until formally introduced (beginning Unit 1 Lesson 1)
- [ ] Grades 2-6: Cards are posted with the pictures facing the class
- [ ] Teacher/Students use the cards as a resource when reading and writing

**Seating Arrangement**
- [ ] Students are seated so everyone can readily see the Sound/Spelling cards (A 'U' shape desk arrangement is suggested)
- [ ] Primary grade students are seated on the carpet for activities not involving writing; Intermediate students are seated to encourage discussion and collaboration
- [ ] Groupings provide a collegial cultural forum

**Concept/Question Board**
- [ ] Current unit theme displayed on the Concept/Question board
- [ ] Concept/Question Board is easily accessible to students
- [ ] Evidence of contributions from students and teacher

The Concept/Question board is a scrapbook of information generated throughout student exploration during each unit. Students/Teachers contribute questions, comments, drawings, pictures, books, articles...

**Materials and Instruction**
- [ ] Evidence of Imagine It! Reading teacher and student materials being used (Big Books, Student Readers, Skills Practice workbooks, Decodable books etc.)
- [ ] Grades K-6: Teacher has comprehension strategies and skills prominently posted or displayed as a resource for students
- [ ] Teacher is using Imagine It! Reading Teacher’s Edition during instruction
- [ ] Instruction is focused on the lesson in the Teacher’s Edition
- [ ] Teacher is explicitly modeling comprehension strategies, comprehension skills or reading with a writer’s eye during 1st or 2nd Read. (Big Books, Student Readers and Decodables)
- [ ] Language of instruction is consistent
- [ ] Lesson pacing is appropriate
- [ ] Supplemental materials support the instruction in Imagine It! Reading

**Comments**
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## Corrective Reading Decoding Walkthrough Form

**Teacher:** __________  **Date:** __________  **Period:** __________

**School:** __________  **Observer:** __________

**Level:** __________  **Lesson Number:** __________

### Observation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students are visible to the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials are organized, distributed, and managed well during lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR rules reviewed before beginning lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review list reviewed prior to lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Word Attack / Boardwork:

- Students are tracking in student book
- Students respond in unison
- Responses are correct and confident

### Corrections in Word Attack:

**Steps**

- That word is______
- What word?
- Spell______
- What word?
- Start Over

### STORY READING:

- Students are tracking
- Student errors are corrected with, “That word is ______.”
- Student re-reads sentence.
- Fluent reading praised, Dysfluent reading corrected with model-test.
- Appropriate question strategies are used
  - Teacher gets attention.
  - Teacher asks question.
  - Teacher gives wait time for individual responses.
  - Teacher calls on group or individual to respond.
- If an error occurs, Teacher has group scan the text and has same student answer.

### CHECKOUTS/PAIRED READINGS:

- Assign student partners / Quick transitions.
- Students count errors on tally sheets.
- Teacher paces / monitors checkouts.

### WORKBOOK:

- Teacher monitors independent work.
- Workbooks are checked.
- Incorrect answers are corrected

### Pacing Guide

- Mastery Test Summary Forms
- Fluency Checkout Forms
- Student Graphs (B1, B2, C) in back of student book
## Connecting Math Concepts or Corrective Math Walkthrough Form

Teacher: ___________________  Date: ___________  Period: ________
School: ___________________  Observer: _______________
Level: ___________________  Lesson Number: ___________

### Observation:
- All students are visible to the teacher.
- Materials are organized, distributed, and managed well during lesson.
- STAR rules reviewed before beginning lesson.

### Math Exercises:
- Teacher follows script of lesson and delivers with conversation pace
- Teacher transitions between exercises quickly
- Boardwork exercises are visible to all students
- Teacher signal is clear & consistent (e.g., looking at book/web)
- Teacher signal is clear & consistent (e.g., hand-drops, looking at teacher)
- Students respond in unison
- Group responses are accurate (over 80%) and confident
- Group responses are fluent and paced like conversation
- Teacher provides individual turns once group response is firm

### Corrections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEXTBOOK/WORKBOOK:
- Teacher monitors independent work.
- Teacher ensures understanding of all directions.
- Workbooks are checked in an organized way.
- Incorrect answers are corrected.

- Lesson Progress/Pacing Guide
- Mastery Test Summary Forms
Appendix G.D

TEACHSCAPE CWT STANDARDS LOOK FORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Course/Content:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>Subject:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>Focus:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Focus on Curriculum
   1a. What is the learning objective(s) for the lesson?
   Objective(s)?
   1b. Learning objective(s) is evident to the students (select one)
   - [ ] Evident
   - [ ] Not evident
   - [ ] Unable to determine
   1c. Learning objective(s) on target for grade-level standards (select one)
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Unable to determine

2. Focus on Instruction
   2a. Identify instructional practices
   - Coaching
   - Informal assessment
   - Modeling
   - Providing opportunities for practice
   - Discussion
   - Learning centers
   - Presentation
   - Teacher-directed Q & A
   - Hands-on experiences
   - Lecture
   - Providing directions/instructions
   - Testing

2b. Identify grouping format
   - Whole group
   - Small group
   - Paired
   - Individual

2c-2d. Identify research-based instructional strategies (2c. Teacher, 2d. Student)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Focus on the Learner
   3a. Identify student actions
   - Listening
   - Working with hands-on materials
   - Reading
   - Writing
   - Speaking

3b. Identify instructional materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Determine level(s) of student work
   - Recalling information (Knowledge)
   - Using information in a new way (Application)
   - Putting information together in new ways (Synthesis)
   - Understanding information (Comprehension)
   - Breaking down information into parts (Analysis)
   - Making judgments and justifying positions (Evaluation)

3d. Determine levels of class engagement (select one)
   - Highly engaged—Most students are authentically engaged
   - Well managed—Students are willingly compliant, ritually engaged
   - Dysfunctional—Many students actively reject the assigned task or substitute another activity

4. Focus on Classroom Environment
   - Materials are available in the classroom
   - Routines and procedures are evident
   - Students interact with classroom environment
   - Models/exemplars of quality student work posted
   - Scoring rubrics are displayed/provided
   - Student work displayed
   - None

5. Focus on the Needs of All Learners
   The teacher is responding to specific learning needs through differentiation of:
   - Content
   - Learning environment
   - Process
   - Product
   - Unable to determine
Academic Support Team (AST) Progress Report

School:      Team Leader:   Month:

AYP:      School Improvement Level:

Targets Not Met: Reading   Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan Instructional Priorities</th>
<th>Research Based Strategies/Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings

Area(s) of Focus

1.

Number of Classrooms Visited:
SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
Office of Accountability Curriculum and Assessment

Academic Support Team (AST) Progress Report

Classroom Visit Outcome:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths:

Concerns:

Fidelity of Implementation:
**Support Plan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Instructional Support</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Person responsible</td>
<td>Completed by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Instructional Initiative**

Green | Yellow | Red

---

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
Office of Accountability Curriculum and Assessment

Academic Support Team (AST) Progress Report
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EMPOWERMENT SCHOOLS PARENT BROCHURE

**Empowerment Schools**
Providing a safe and nurturing school environment

Student learning and academic success is the main goal

Students are taught by the best and most qualified teachers

Great school leadership

Offering art, music, sports and clubs

440 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130

Phone: 215-400-4000
Fax: 215-400-4386
E-mail: 0656@philasd.org

Empowerment Schools: A Model for Student Success

Office of Empowerment Schools Support
Building Success one student at a time.
Ten: 215-400-6000
Empowerment Schools

The School District of Philadelphia (SDP) started the Empowerment Model to support schools that have not performed well academically for at least four or more years straight. The goal of the model is to provide students who attend these schools with a safe school environment, strong teachers, an effective principal, materials to improve and excel, student's reading and mathematics and staff to support parents and students with attendance and truancy. Empowerment Schools focus on:

- Student Success
- Providing a Safe and Nurturing Environment
- Recruiting and Retaining Great Staff
- Support for Parents and Students
- Sports and Activities

Student Success is the Goal

Student experience success when they know what they need to learn and the expectations you have for them and outside the classroom are clear and explained to them. Empowerment Schools will provide an environment where the expectation is for the student to learn and be successful. When students experience success in the classroom they are ready to extend and appropriately participate and plan for life after high school. Students will receive daily instruction in:

- Reading
- Mathematics
- Social Studies
- Science
- Art
- Music

All Empowerment Schools will have an extra reading and mathematics class each day for students who need extra help or are moving faster than their classmates.

All Empowerment K-3 classrooms will have no more than 24 students and grades 4 through 8 will have no more than 25 students.

Safe and Nurturing Schools

Schools need to be a safe environment so students are free to learn and are free from fear. Empowerment schools will provide a safe and nurturing environment where students feel safe and can focus on learning and being successful. The adults and students in the school will be taught to follow and share the same beliefs, values, rules and procedures.

Great Staff

Great Staff is the key to an effective school and student success. Empowerment Schools will only hire the most qualified teachers and administrators who believe in the school and the students. Teachers and administrators will be trained regularly on what works best to make your child be as successful as he or she can be.

Support for Parents and Students

Meeting the needs of all of the students is important to their success. Each Empowerment School will have extra staff. There will be staff to help students and who have trouble with coming to school on time and every day. There will be staff to work with parents and help them get more involved in the school activities and their child’s learning. All Empowerment Schools will have a full-time nurse to address health needs.

Sports and Activities

Students attending Empowerment School will have the opportunity to participate in team sports. Empowerment Schools will offer the traditional sports of baseball, football, and basketball. Students will also be able to participate in track, lacrosse, wrestling, tennis, volleyball and cheerleading. Students will also have the opportunity to participate in intramural sports. We will also have clubs. Students can join the chess club or book club. We will also offer cooking, dance, art and computer classes. Students who have...
The Empowerment Model is a support model for high need schools implemented within the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). The Empowerment Model provided supports in four areas: leadership, operations, student and family support and instruction. One of the main supports provided in the area of instruction was the School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS). The SBIS was located at a school to support the implementation of the Empowerment Instructional Model and provide direct support to the teaching staff. As a pivotal component of the Empowerment Model, I thought it was important to interview the SBISs and obtain their perspective on their experiences and the effectiveness of the supports they received. The trends identified will also be used to inform future decisions related to the position.

Six SBISs were interviewed in person over a two-week period in their school. During the interview, notes were taken and recorded to assure accuracy of responses to each question. The interview consisted of nine questions focusing on the following areas: daily functions and responsibilities, effectiveness in the position and supports received as an SBIS. Appendix A outlines the protocol utilized during the interview process. The analysis and coding of the interviews consisted of several steps. The first step was to
listen to each interview and type out their responses. The second step was to code the responses of the SBISs. The final step was to identify the trends. This paper will provide the results of the interviews, focusing on the three aforementioned areas: daily functions and responsibilities, effectiveness in the position and supports received by the SBIS.

**Daily Functions and Responsibilities**

The SBIS played a major role in the Empowerment Model. The SBIS provided school-based support and played an integral role in the implementation and monitoring of the core and supplemental instructional initiatives. When the six SBISs interviewed spoke about their responsibilities, their responses centered on four primary areas: monitoring the implementation of the core and intervention instructional programs, teacher development, turn around training and analyzing data. Some of the examples provided were modeling lessons, helping teachers to learn to write and deliver better lessons and visiting classrooms to see if teachers are using instructional materials with fidelity.

All six voiced two similar purposes to their work. First, they all spoke about how they were there to improve the instructional practice: helping good teachers become better teachers, or developing and supporting the struggling teacher. Second, they were there to improve the academic outcome of their school. Table 1 outlines the trends identified regarding their daily functions and responsibilities.
Table 24

School Based Instructional Specialists (SBIS) Daily Functions and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function and Responsibility</th>
<th>Number of SBIS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn around training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate interventions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness in the Position

As stated earlier, all of the SBISs expressed the importance of their role in developing teachers and improving the academic outcomes of their school. With such an important role, their effectiveness is critical to the overall improvement of their school. All six SBISs thought they were very effective in their positions and their ability to provide the expected services and supports to the teachers within their school. Many noted that teachers sought them out for support and guidance on how to appropriately and effectively implement curriculum materials.

There were two underlying themes in the responses provided related to their level of effectiveness and how the staff reacted. The first theme was the rapport and relationships they had with their teachers and the second theme was their ability to build and establish trust. Interviewee A stated “I think I was very effective because I
established a great rapport with the teachers and they felt more comfortable about opening up and speaking about areas they needed support in. "Interviewee C stated” I was respected and looked at as a model teacher. I was able to establish relationships with my teachers and an overall trust because they knew I was giving them information that would benefit them.” They all attributed their strong relationships with teachers to their hands-on approach. They all described the need to show they can do what they were expecting teachers to do. They also spoke about how they presented themselves, as a peer in the same bargaining unit here to support the teacher. They all made reference to teachers needing to feel comfortable and safe. Teachers need to know it is okay not to know something and ask for help without it being used against them. Interviewee D said “Sometimes it takes a peer versus an administrator who has been in the same shoes and can walk that same walk guiding them from beginning to end, non-evaluative so they can progress.”

**Supports Received by the SBIS**

To get a full understanding of the supports and services provided to SBISs, I thought it was important to ask them about their experiences prior to becoming an SBIS. All six held previous positions that included providing some level of direct support and coaching to teachers. It was expected they would have this experience because it was one of the minimum requirements to become an SBIS.

Whether they were a School Growth Teacher, New Teacher Coach, or a Literacy or Mathematics Lead Teacher, the support they received were provided predominately by
the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and occasionally by their region or other central office departments. All six described the professional development and support provided as periodic, limited and unfulfilling. They all spoke about how the professional development was more of an information meeting. They were given notes and updates about things happening in the district. Additionally, there was this expectation that as professionals, they were primarily responsible for their own development. Lastly, there was not a great deal of focus on the services being delivered and the resources being used. One of themes that came out of this was their lack of opportunity for growth. They all questioned how they could be effective if they were not growing. Interviewee E said “prior to becoming an SBIS, I was a Literacy Coach and I received monthly professional development form my regional superintendent. I would find professional development on my own to help improve my skills and abilities as a teacher leader.”

The SBIS received many supports, but for the purpose of this interview I focused on the on-site coaching provided by the publishing company consultants and the School Improvement Specialist (SIS) and the training provided by the publishing company consultants and the SIS. I wanted to know how they would rate these services, what they found to be the most effective component, the least effective component and how they would improve the training being provided. All six interviewed were asked to rate the training provided by the publishing company on a 10-point scale. Based on the responses provided the mean was 7.8 (SD=0.7). They all found the training beneficial. Using the actual materials teachers were going to use was critical for them to turnkey this training to the teachers in their building.
They also liked that the training focused on what was important and needed to be delivered at that time. The training mirrored the expectations that the Empowerment Office had for the field. When the programs were beginning, the training focused on the initial stages of implementation: understanding what implementing with fidelity looks like, how students should be assessed, how to determine the number of teachers needed, how to establish groups and order materials based on the results of the assessments. Interviewee F said “the summer training was the most beneficial. They had us grouped according to the content and grade levels, which was more supportive to what we had to learn.”

The expertise of the consultants also was identified as one of the most effective aspects of the training. The individuals providing the training had extensive experience using the product. Interviewee E said “the trainers were teachers, not consultants without experience implementing the program.”

However, there were two trends that arose when they were asked about the least effective aspect: the presentation style and the depth of the training. Although all said the training was effective, they all expressed one way or another that the training needed to go deeper. There was too much lecture and theory and there needed to be even more hands-on opportunities. Interviewee A said “the presentation style focused more on lecture and theory. Although hands-on opportunities were provided, there were not enough. Interviewee F said “the trainers would only talk about grades K and 1 and by the third training they were still talking about K and 1 and most of us were bored.” Table 2
outlines the trends of the most and least effective components of the publishing company consultant training.

Table 25

*Most and Least Effective Component of Publishing Company Consultant Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Effective Trend</th>
<th>Number of SBIS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hands on experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise of the publishing company consultants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of program materials during training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of implementation plans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupings during training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear program expectations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Effective Trend</th>
<th>Number of SBIS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation style: lecture and theory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of depth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early grade focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough hands on opportunities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked how they would improve the training the responses focused on the presentation style and the depth of the training. Interviewee B said ”I would try to go deeper, send out more trainers to be able to focus on more specific needs as it relates to the program and the needs of the SBISs.” Table 3 outlines the trends regarding how to improve the training.
Table 26

**How to Improve Publishing Company Consultant Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Number of SBIS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More hands on opportunities with program materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More depth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include teachers in initial training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group SBISs based on skill level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to address school specific needs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I posed the same series of questions about the training provided by SIS: how you would rate it and why; the most effective aspect; the least effective aspect; and how you would improve the training. All six rated the training provided by the SIS 8.5 on a 10-point scale (SD=0.5). They all viewed the SIS as a resource. Their responses focused on the accessibility of the SIS, their ability to answer questions and provide solutions. Interviewee C said “they were good because they provided overarching training and were able to help you with your specific teachers and supports. They were also able to dissect the training to focus it towards your school.”

When asked what the most beneficial aspect of the training, two trends were identified: the opportunity and benefits of collaborating with other SBISs and their ability to remove barriers and respond to questions and concerns (see Table 4). Having the opportunity to interact with their colleagues and being able to problem solve collectively was invaluable. They all spoke about having the opportunity to talk with someone who is
“in the same boat” as you are and can identify with what you are experiencing.

Interviewee D said “we were given an opportunity to collaborate with other SBISs during the SIS training. We discussed best practices and how to tackle specific challenges.” They all made reference to the comfort they felt with the SIS, having a person that was readily available to answer questions and help them be successful. Interviewee C said “being able to freely ask questions and wonderings being answered freely and not having to worry about whether you are being judged or questioned.” When asked what the least effective aspect of the training all six said overall there was not a least effective aspect to the training provided by the SIS.

Table 27

*Most Effective Component of the School Improvement Specialist Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most effective trend</th>
<th>Number of SBIS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to collaborate with other SBISs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share best practices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to resolve issues and remove barriers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved performance of SBIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked how they would improve the training the responses focused on differentiating the training to include more feedback from the field and reflective of the skill level of the SBIS. Interviewee D said “many SBIS’ came to the position with extensive experience in providing support and professional development. The trainings
offered were often generalized and did not differentiate for those with more experience, but who were looking for new ideas and ways to support teachers”. Table 5 outlines the trends regarding how to improve the training provided by the SIS.

Table 28

*How to Improve the School Improvement Specialist Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Number of SBIS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease SBIS responsibility to improve availability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate topics based on SBSI experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include teachers in training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities to interact with other SBISs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead more of the trainings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I posed the same series of questions about the onsite coaching provided by the SIS and the publishing company: how you would rate it and why; the most effective aspect; the least effective aspect; and how you would improve the training. All six rated the onsite coaching provided by the SIS and the publishing company consultants as 8.6 on a 10-point scale (SD=0.7). Their responses focused on the specific feedback provided during the onsite coaching, the visits to the classrooms and the support provided to the SBIS (see Table 6). Interviewee C said “they walked the building with you and would go into classrooms and support teachers, echoing my positive and constructive criticism. They provided another lens assuring you are not missing something.” When asked what the most effective aspect was the responses focused on coaching, feedback and teacher
support Interviewee A said “the SIS understood the aspect of the teachers and could respond to implementation based on the type of student learner.” When asked what the least effective aspect was, all six said overall there was not a least effective aspect of the on-site training.

Table 29

*Most Effective Component of the On-site Coaching by School Improvement Specialist and Publishing Company Consultants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most effective trend</th>
<th>Number of SBIS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIS local expertise</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional monitoring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the SBIS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct support to teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with documentation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked how they would improve the onsite training the responses focused on maximizing resources to increase opportunities of support and coaching and a contingency plan for cancellations. Interviewee D said “since there were several schools in the same geographic area, maximizing the dollars spent on onsite trainers and combining schools for follow-up PD could be a way to stretch the dollars and get more support from the program experts”. Table 7 outlines the trends regarding how to improve the onsite coaching provided by the SIS and the publishing company consultants.
Table 30

*How to Improve Onsite Coaching provided by School Improvement Specialist and Publishing Company Consultants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Number of SBIS</th>
<th>SBIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase time of coaches at the school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More modeling in classrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotape to use later trainings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align site support to teacher need</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the interview I gave the SBIS an opportunity to identify and discuss a support that was not mentioned. Although all did not provide a response, those who did respond focused on the leadership within their school, region and central office. Whether they identified their building principal, regional superintendent or the director of the Empowerment Office, the support provided was given a rating of at least as an 8 on a 10-point scale. Interviewee A said “my principal used to be a coach so the conversations I was able to have with him gave me an additional advantage.” Those who provided a response said the most effective aspect was support provided by these individuals. Interviewee F said “the director of the Empowerment Office was extremely informative of what data to use and how to get the information. He was accessible and was able to answer all of your questions; he was very knowledgeable of what to expect and informed us what he expected of us and what the outcomes should be. He had a unique style in which to deliver the information in a non-threatening tone, but able to totally express the importance of it.” When asked what was the least effective aspect of the support...
identified those who responded did not identify a least effective aspect. When asked how they would improve the support identified those who responded answers focused on the opportunity to collaborate more. Interviewee B said “having more time and opportunity to meet and collaborate to discuss how to meet expectations.”

I also gave the SBIS interviewed an opportunity to make any final comments. Overall, all six interviewed said their experience as an SBIS was positive and they learned effective practices and models to support teachers. Interviewee B said “the model we were using is one that should be used in all districts because you are combining the supports of the district as whole, as a region and down to the individual school. If you are going to grow teachers capacity you need peer collaboration, onsite coaching, someone to model and share; the structure of the empowerment model provided that opportunity.”

Conclusions

The overall experience of the SBIS was positive. The supports provided by the publishing company consultants and SIS were effective. The SBISs found the on-site support and training as the most impactful resource because it provided the immediate and explicit feedback to help teachers improve. It also, reaffirmed the directives and guidance they were giving to teachers and enhanced their own professional growth. The SIS and the publishing company consultants were a very good balance of the national and local perspective. The publishing company consultants were able to provide the specific supports related to the product and inform the SBISs of best practices they have observed
throughout the country. The SIS was able to provide customized support related to the product, showing SBISs how to adapt it to their environment. The SIS also functioned as that local expert and resource, able to answer all questions and provide immediate feedback and direction. The other big take away from the interviews was the value assigned to collaborating and interacting with colleagues. They all viewed this as a great asset and wished it would have occurred more. Lastly, the SBISs felt they played a pivotal role in the development of their teaching staff and improving the school’s academic performance.

**Recommendations**

To improve upon the position of the SBIS I recommend the training and supports should be tiered. The SBISs should be placed into cohorts based on expertise and experience. Organizing them into groups will allow more opportunities for in-depth training and individualized support. I would also increase the opportunity to interact with other SBISs. It may even be advantageous to establish a critical friends group, allowing them to collectively resolve issue and support one another. I would also recommend increasing the hands-on opportunities, particularly with the products being used within the school.

There are several recommendations I would make to a district that is trying to improve upon or establish a school based coaching model. The first is to assure there is a method of support and development for the individuals providing support to teachers. The supports provided should include some form of on-site support at the school level.
This creates one of the best ways to provide explicit and immediate feedback regarding the practices being implemented within the school. Another recommendation is to provide systemic and sustained professional development. Any training has to occur regularly to make an impact and should align to the needs of the population being serviced. The final recommendation would be to provide training that teacher, school administrator and coach attend together. Attending the training together will assures everyone is hearing the same thing and has the same understanding. It also helps the school stay on message
Appendix I.A

School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS) Interview Protocol

Hello my name is Stephen Brady and I would like to thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. The interview will focus on your experiences as a School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS). To assure that I accurately capture your responses I will be recording the conversation and taking notes. The information captured will not be reported using your name or any other way to identify your specific responses.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Interview Questions

1. What were the daily functions and responsibilities of the SBIS?
2. How effective do you think you were as an SBIS?
3. How did schools react?
4. What was your experience with support and professional development before you became SBIS?

I would like to discuss the supports provided to SBISs. As a part of the Empowerment Schools model The SBIS received the following supports:

- ON site coaching by School Improvement Specialist (SIS) and publishing company consultants
- Training by publishing company
- Training by SIS

The following series of questions will focus specifically on the supports I identified.

5. How would you rate the training provided by the publishing company and why?
   a. What was the most effective aspect and why?
   b. What was the least effective aspect and why?
   c. How would you improve the training?
6. How would you rate the training provided by the SIS and why?
   a. What was the most effective aspect and why?
   b. What was the least effective aspect and why?
   c. How would you improve the training?

7. How would you rate the onsite coaching of the SIS and the publishing company and why?
   a. What was the most effective aspect and why?
   b. What was the least effective aspect and why?
   c. How would you improve the training?

Are there any other supports that you received as an SBIS that I did not mention that you would like to discuss?

8. How would you rate the (interviewee identified support) and why?
   a. What was the most effective aspect and why?
   b. What was the least effective aspect and why?
   c. How would you improve the training?

That is the final question I have

9. Are there any comments you would like to add regarding the supports and your overall experience as an SBIS?

This concludes the interview and I want to thank you again for your time and agreeing to be interviewed.
EVALUATION OF THE SCHOOL BASED INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALIST
SRA PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Executive Summary

My EPP focuses on the development of a support model for high need schools.

The evaluation of the School Based Instructional Specialist SRA Professional Development was included as an artifact because the interventions are a pivotal component of the model. The evaluation provided preliminary data regarding the effectiveness of the professional development and the implementation of the intervention. Evaluation findings also provided feedback for future modifications to the professional development and overall implementation of the intervention.
Introduction

The 2008-2009 Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) test results for the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) showed a record sixth consecutive year of growth in mathematics and reading scores. Mathematics scores rose 3.2 percentage points over last year, or 32.7 percentage points since 2002, and reading scores rose 3.9 percentage points over the last year and 23.8 percentage points since 2002. PSSA results reported by student groups also showed increases in all categories when reported by race/ethnicity, students with disabilities, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged students. The percentage of students scoring Below Basic, which is the lowest performance level, continued to decline. In reading, the numbers declined by 4.0 percentage points and in mathematics by 2.7 percentage points. As the eighth largest urban district, the gains illustrated by the SDP shows great promise, but they are not enough; 52.3% of the students are not proficient on the PSSA in reading and 47.8% are not proficient in mathematics. When you begin to look at the results school by school, the overall gains as a district do not seem that significant.

There are 265 schools in the district. There are 76 schools within the district categorized with the most severe AYP status of Corrective Action II (CAII). There are 15 schools within the district categorized with the AYP status of Making Progress Corrective Action II (CAII), which means they met AYP for the previous school year. A school’s AYP status determines the level of support they are eligible for as well as the
actions a district and or state may take to improve student achievement. Corrective Action I is defined as a school or school district that does not make yearly progress for four or more consecutive years. Corrective Action II signifies a school has not made AYP for at least five consecutive years. Corrective Action I schools are eligible for various levels of technical assistance and are subject to escalating consequences (e.g., changes in curriculum, leadership, professional development). Corrective Action II schools are eligible for the same types of technical assistance, but they also are subject to governance changes such as reconstitution, chartering, and privatization.

The Empowerment Schools Initiative targets schools that are in Corrective Action Phase II as identified by Adequate Yearly Progress under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The goal of the Empowerment Schools Initiative is to increase achievement at schools with large numbers of underperforming students by providing targeted interventions at school sites which address systemic barriers that interfere with the process of teaching and learning.

The Office of Empowerment School Support (OESS) currently provides services to 95 schools in Corrective Action Phase II. Twenty-three of the schools are identified as Empowerment I Schools, which receive the most intense level of resources and 62 schools are identified as Empowerment II Schools. The targeted interventions and resources received by the schools are concentrated in four areas: Instructional Support, Student and Family Services, Leadership Support and Operational Support. For the purpose of this evaluation I will focus on the instructional element.
The goal of the OESS is to provide instructional support that increases the effectiveness of instructional practices of teachers within Empowerment Schools. This will be achieved by enhancing pedagogical skills and content knowledge to positively impact student achievement. The School Based Instructional Specialist (SBIS) is utilized to meet the instructional goals of OESS by providing hands-on school based support for teachers. OESS provides professional development to the SBIS in the areas of Assessment, Accountability, Intervention, Curriculum, Leadership, Research, and Best Practices in School Improvement and Education.

The PSSA is administered annually and assesses student’s ability to demonstrate proficiency on the Pennsylvania standards at their grade level in Reading and Mathematics. The test is constructed from eligible content, which is grade specific. Eligible content is the core of the standard and anchors. It represents what the state has identified as potential competencies for students which can be measured at each grade level. The Reading component of the PSSA has two reporting categories. The reporting categories are:

A. Comprehension and Reading Skills

A.1 Understand fiction appropriate to grade level

A.2 Understanding nonfiction appropriate to grade level

B. Interpretation and Analysis of Fictional and Nonfictional Text

B.1 Understand components within and between texts
B.2 Understand concepts and organization of nonfictional text

The Mathematics component of the PSSA has five reporting categories. The reporting categories are:

A. Numbers and Operations

B. Measurement

C. Geometry

D. Algebraic Concepts

E. Data Analysis and Probability

Only 35.7% of students within Empowerment Schools were proficient in Reading and 39.5% in Mathematics on the PSSA. The results of the PSSA within the Empowerment Schools illustrated an overwhelming need for a school wide Reading and Math intervention model. Therefore, The School District of Philadelphia entered into a contract with SRA to purchase Corrective Reading and Math for grades four through nine and Language for Learners, Reading Mastery, and Connected Math for grades Kindergarten through three. The Intervention has two areas of focus in reading: decoding and comprehension. The students who performed below proficiency on the PSSA demonstrated great weakness in both areas. Therefore, students will be screened for decoding first and comprehension second. There are six areas of focus within the math intervention, which all align to the Numbers and Operations and Algebraic Concepts reporting categories of the PSSA. In addition, all Empowerment Schools will have an
intervention period within their school so they can effectively implement the intervention across their school. This was made possible by modifying the reading and math block to incorporate the forty-five minute intervention period. The SBIS will provide the instructional support related to the intervention. The SBISs will be trained by SRA national consultants in all phases of the intervention to service their school. The consultants will also provide on-site support to teachers on a daily basis. Consultants trained principals as well on the intervention, focusing on monitoring.

**Purpose of Evaluation**

Within the School District of Philadelphia, schools historically were able to purchase supports for students without rhyme or reason. It was not clear how schools chose these supports for students, if they had the capacity to implement with fidelity, or if they were effective. On the average, Empowerment Schools were implementing nine different interventions. There were a lot of resources within schools, but there were minimal results. Dr. Ackerman, the Superintendent of the district, stated that Empowerment Schools would no longer have the ability to choose their own interventions. The district decided instead to implement a single math and reading intervention across schools for the first time. In addition, several changes were made in the instructional block and training to assure implementation with fidelity.

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine the effectiveness of the SRA professional development program. More simply, are the SBIS able to implement the school wide intervention in reading and math after receiving professional development.
The findings will be used to inform future decisions related to their professional development and implementation and monitoring of the intervention.

**Evaluation Question**

Professional development is a critical tool when implementing something new. It is the vehicle used to disseminate the message and expectations as it relates to the program. It is the first variable thought of when an organization is trying to make something work and when it is not working as effectively. The evaluation focuses on professional development and implementation of the intervention. It consists of two types of questions: a process and an outcome question. The process question focused on professional development and the questions:

- To what extent has the professional development provided the School Based Instructional Specialists with a clear understanding to guide implementation of the program at their respective school?

The process question focused on the professional development provided by the SRA consultants and experienced by the SBIS. The purpose of the question is to gain insight on the SBISs’ understanding of the elements of the intervention and the components critical for implementation.

I am evaluating a program that began in August of 2009 and is still in the implementation stage. Therefore, the question I pose is an interim outcome question. The outcome question focuses on implementation and the question is:
What percentages of Empowerment Schools began the intervention by the identified start date and are implementing the program as expected?

The outcome question focuses on the implementation of the intervention. The purpose of the question is to gain insight on the level of implementation and the schools’ capacity to meet the expectations of the intervention and the district.

The relationship between the two questions is critical. The two questions are dependent upon one another. The outcome is impacted by the process: the understanding and internalizing of the professional development will influence the school’s capacity to meet the expectations of the intervention and district. If the desired outcome is not achieved, the first element that will be reviewed is the professional development that was provided to the SBISs.

Sample

For the purpose of the evaluation I relied on a census using the elementary and middle school SBISs. To acquire the position, the candidate must have previous experience as an instructional leader outside of the classroom for at least three years and demonstrate content knowledge and ability to coach teachers. Currently there are 71 elementary and middle school SBISs and all are highly qualified according to No Child Left Behind standards. The main responsibility of the position is to provide onsite instructional support for teachers. SBISs receive full-day professional development on a weekly basis. The professional development focuses on the core curriculum materials,
reading and mathematics interventions, instructional leadership, coaching, data analysis, and research based strategies. The SBISs were chosen as a critical sample for the evaluation because of their integral role with the intervention at the school level. There they also function as a project manager and instructional guide concerning the intervention.

The 71 Elementary and Middle Empowerment schools were visited by central office personnel. The purpose of the visit was to complete a walk-through checklist focusing on the implementation of the SRA intervention.

**Variables/Instruments**

The first instrument I used is a survey with the SBISs. The survey consists of 17 Likert questions that focuses on the benefit, preparation, and effectiveness of the Reading SRA professional development (see Appendix A).

The second instrument I used is a walk-through checklist completed by central office staff during site visits to the 71 Elementary and Middle Empowerment Schools (see Appendix B). The checklist consists of five questions that focus on the implementation of the Reading SRA intervention, including materials, scheduling, appropriate use of materials and class size.
Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The data collection procedures for both evaluations consisted of several steps. The first was to develop both instruments. I conducted a pilot test with the professional development survey, asking the School Improvement Support Specialists (SIS) to complete a draft version. The SISs were the ideal candidates because they also participated in the SRA training and were responsible for supporting the SBIS in their efforts. No changes were required. I reviewed the overall purpose of the survey with the SBISs and how the results of the survey will be shared. They completed the survey at the designated professional development session and turned them in to me at the end of the session.

I conducted a pilot test with the walk-through instrument using the central office staff and the instructional support positions within the regions. I reviewed the overall purpose of the walk-through instrument with the staff that would be visiting the Empowerment Schools to collect the data and answered their questions; approximately ten schools were identified to visit to test the survey in the school environment. Again, no changes were necessary based on the pilot test. Seventy five staff from the various offices within central office was divided into teams of at least three people and each team was assigned to visit one or more Empowerment Schools. In total, 63 schools were visited during this evaluation. The number of classrooms visited within each school was based on the number of students and intervention options being offered within the school. Appendix C provides the exact number of classrooms visited at each school. The staff
visiting each school was provided a schedule that identified the classrooms to visit. The staff completed a survey for each class they visited. After completing all class visits, the central office staff returned all surveys to the Office of Empowerment Schools Support.

Upon completion of the surveys and walk-through instruments, the data was compiled and descriptive statistics calculated.

**Findings**

The survey was administered to the 71 elementary and middle SBISs. Forty seven surveys were completed. Table 1 represents the frequency of response and percent for each item.

**Table 31**  
*School Based Instructional Specialist SRA Professional Development Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention PD</th>
<th>No Benefit</th>
<th>Little Benefit</th>
<th>Some Benefit</th>
<th>Great Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of interventions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series and facilitators guides</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands on opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue with SRA consultants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering Placement tests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample placement tests and ordering packets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn around training materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Not prepared</th>
<th>Minimally prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Very Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model a lesson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop class rosters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate pacing and signaling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide turn around training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the SRA reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Minimally effective</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Reading Intervention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Math Intervention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering placement tests and</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N represents the number of respondents per response. All respondents did not answer every question of the survey therefore the number may not add up to 47 and the percentage may not add up to 100.

SBISs rated the overview of the interventions and the dialogue with the consultants’ highest (i.e., 95.7 percent and 95.6 percent respectively assigned ratings of “great benefit” or “some benefit”). The two lowest SBIS rated areas were the turnaround training materials, 25.4 percent and the administering of the placement test (25.4 percent and 23.5 percent respectively assigned ratings of “little benefit” or “no benefit”).
Eighty-five percent of the SBIS said they were somewhat to very prepared to implement the SRA reading intervention and 78.6 percent said they were somewhat to very prepared to model a lesson. When responding to how prepared they were to demonstrate pacing and signaling, 80.7 percent said they were somewhat to very prepared. When responding to how prepared they were to provide turn around training, 68 percent said they were somewhat to very prepared to provide turn around training to their staff in their respective buildings.

The walk-through checklist was used during the site visits to the 71 Elementary and Middle Empowerment Schools. A checklist was completed for each Elementary and Middle Empowerment School.

Table 32
Average Percent Results of Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading Implementation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total schools visited</th>
<th>Total classrooms visited</th>
<th>Appropriate Lesson</th>
<th>Classes with less than 25 students</th>
<th>Teachers using script</th>
<th>Students have workbooks</th>
<th>All appropriate classrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AV G %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AV G %</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1187</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy one site visits were conducted using the checklist and 1,187 classrooms were visited. Of the 1,187 classrooms visited, about half (52 percent) of the schools were on the appropriate lesson. Almost all classrooms visited (98 percent) had less than 25 students in the classes, almost all teachers (94 percent) were using the script, almost all
students (95 percent) had workbooks, and almost all schools visited (94 percent) had the intervention in the designated classrooms and at the designated time.

These two data sets, when combined, suggest that schools were able to more closely adhere to logistical issues (i.e., number of students assigned to classroom, delivering the intervention in designated classrooms at designated times) than to the instructional expectations and fidelity of the programs.

**Conclusions**

The School District of Philadelphia implemented the SRA intervention in the Empowerment Schools. The SBIS played an integral role in the implementation at the school level. The SBISs had an overall positive feeling about the SRA professional development and the role it played in their ability to meet the expectations of implementation, particularly related to performing certain tasks related to implementation. Although numbers stayed relatively favorable, they did drop significantly when asked about their ability to perform certain tasks with their assigned teachers. This was evident when comparing the survey and checklist results.

When comparing the findings of the checklist to related questions on the survey the results demonstrated the SBIS felt more comfortable with logistical expectations of the implementation process. They were able to get the teachers to use the script and provide the materials to the students during the class, but when it came to the actual
implementation of the program there was a noticeable difference. Many said they felt they could demonstrate pacing and signaling, which are critical to the fidelity of the program. However, when the schools were visited many teachers were not on the appropriate lesson. Based on the survey results the training seem to be very effective, but the site visit walk-through demonstrates a need to spend more time on implementation, particularly lesson pacing.

Two components that could be explored in a future evaluation are leadership and monitoring. The survey and walk-through instruments did not focus on monitoring or leadership. It would be interesting to assess the impact of monitoring and the impact and support of leadership to the overall process and the SBIS. The SRA program was implemented, but the company and the district seem to define the success of the implementation differently. According to the expectations set forth by the company, the district is ahead of schedule and doing well considering the multiple programs they have put in place. Yet, the district views it as only moderately successful based on the percentage of teachers on the appropriate lesson.

**Recommendations**

Based on the above results, it is my recommendation to increase the amount of individualized site based professional development for the SBISs. The increased professional development will focus on the fidelity of implementation plan for their respective school. Outlining and detailing the roles, materials, process, procedures and
instructional expectations related to the implementation of the SRA programs will provide SBISs with more structure and guidance at the school level.

I would also recommend the development of a school based monitoring and support plan. The SBISs had only minimal difficulty with the logistical expectations of the program, but they faced difficulties with pacing and the instructional expectations (52 percent). Although the professional development reviewed what evidence should be collected, but it did not speak explicitly to how to monitor either for fidelity or to support teachers. The development and implementation of a monitoring and support plan would allow the efficient and timely identification of appropriate practice and overall fidelity. It would also assist in identifying who is in need of support and how to support them.
Appendix J.A

School Based Instructional Specialist SRA Professional Development Survey

Directions: Please take a few minutes to respond to the following questions about professional development provided by SRA in relation to the reading and mathematics intervention. The Office of Empowerment School Support will use the results of the survey to inform the planning of future professional development related to the SRA intervention.

For questions 1-7 please rate the extent to which you feel the following elements prepared you for implementation of the intervention. Use the scale below for your ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = no benefit</th>
<th>2 = little benefit</th>
<th>3 = some benefit</th>
<th>4 = great benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The overview of Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Corrective math, and Connecting Math</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The series and facilitators guides</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Hands on opportunities and real world examples</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Dialogue with national SRA consultants</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Administering Placement tests</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Sample placement tests and ordering packets</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Turn around training materials</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For questions 8-12 please rate the extent to which you prepared to do the following as a result of the professional development. Use the scale below for your ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = not prepared</th>
<th>2 = minimally prepared</th>
<th>3 = somewhat prepared</th>
<th>4 = very prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8) Model a lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Develop class rosters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Demonstrate pacing and signaling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Provide turn around training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Implement the SRA reading intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = not effective</th>
<th>2 = minimally effective</th>
<th>3 = somewhat effective</th>
<th>4 = very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13) Understanding and Implementing Reading Mastery and Corrective reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Understanding and Implementing Connecting Math and Corrective Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Administering placement tests and the ordering process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16) Please identify the building configuration where you currently provide instructional support.

- [ ] Elementary
- [ ] Middle
- [ ] High School

17) Please identify the number of years you have served as an instructional coach providing support to teachers.

- [ ] 0-3 years
- [ ] 4-6 years
- [ ] 7-10 years
- [ ] 11+ years
**Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading Implementation Monitoring**

**Region:** ________________________________

**School:** ________________________________

**Time of Visit:** _________________________

**Number of Classrooms Visited:** __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room #s for “No” responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are teachers on the <strong>appropriate</strong> lesson? (Lessons 7-11 are appropriate based on start date of 10/13 and doing 1 lesson a day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are there less than <strong>25 students</strong> in a classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are teachers reading from a <strong>script</strong> out of their Teacher Presentation book?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do students have <strong>workbooks</strong> out on their desks <strong>OR</strong> have a visual at the front of the room with text that they are following along with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you see Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading in all <strong>appropriate classrooms</strong> based on the schedule you received? (if possible, scan every scheduled classroom, for large schools, scan at least 75% of appropriate classrooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checklist Completed by: ____________________________________________

Name
## Appendix J.C
### School Visit Checklist Results by Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Classrooms Visited</th>
<th>Appropriate lesson</th>
<th>Less than 25 students</th>
<th>Teachers using script</th>
<th>Students have workbooks</th>
<th>All appropriate classrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/29</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16/29? (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/30</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/22</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/23</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/42</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Classrooms Visited</td>
<td>Appropriate lesson</td>
<td>Less than 25 students</td>
<td>Teachers using script</td>
<td>Students have workbooks</td>
<td>All appropriate classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>